







# *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*

---

VOLUME XXXIX

OCTOBER, 1953

NUMBER 3

---

Edited by

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director of the Association

BERTHA TUMA

Assistant Editor

ELIZABETH HORN

Editorial Assistant

Published by the

*Association of American Colleges*

N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

*Editorial Offices*

726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

March, May, October, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at  
Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, embodied in Paragraph (d-2) Section 34.40 P. L. & R. of 1948.

## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1953-54

*President:* John R. Cunningham, President, Davidson College.

*Vice President:* R. H. Fitzgerald, Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh.

*Treasurer:* Joseph R. N. Maxwell, President, Boston College.

*Executive Director:* Guy E. Snavelly.

*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly.

*Board of Directors:* (additional members) Thomas E. Jones, President, Earlham College; Arthur G. Coons, President, Occidental College; J. Ollie Edmunds, President, Stetson University; William W. Whitehouse, President, Albion College.

---

## STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

**COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE:** (1954) President Eugene S. Briggs, Phillips University, *Chairman*; President Andrew C. Smith, Spring Hill College; President George D. Grice, College of Charleston; (1955) President Louis T. Benezet, Allegheny College; President Rufus E. Clement, Atlanta University; (1956) President Sarah G. Blanding, Vassar College; President Edward J. O'Donnell, Marquette University; President L. E. Smith, Elon College.

**COMMISSION ON THE ARTS:** (1954) President John T. Caldwell, University of Arkansas; President R. C. Cook, Mississippi Southern College; President Calvert N. Ellis, Juniata College, *Chairman*; (1955) President M. Dorothea Dunkerley, College of New Rochelle; President Rosemary Park, Connecticut College; President John L. Knight, Baldwin Wallace College; President Paul M. Pitman, College of Idaho; (1956) President Don H. Morris, Abilene Christian College; President H. Sherman Oberly, Roanoke College; President Bryan S. Stoffer, Washburn University; President J. Walter Malone, James Millikin University.

**COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION:** (1954) Secretary E. Fay Campbell, Presbyterian Board of Christian Education; President Matt L. Ellis, Hendrix College; President William G. Ryan, Seton Hill College; President Harlie L. Smith, Board of Education, Disciples of Christ; President Andrew G. Truxall, Hood College, *Chairman*; (1955) President W. A. Bell, Miles College; President Carl M. Reinert, Creighton University; President V. F. Schwalm, Manchester College; President Clarence C. Stoughton, Wittenberg College; President Harold W. Tribble, Wake Forest College; (1956) President Russell J. Humbert, DePauw University; President Weir C. Ketler, Grove City College; President John L. McNulty, Seton Hall University; President George M. Modlin, University of Richmond; President

\* NOTE: Term expires on date indicated.

Harold L. Yochum, Capital University; Secretary General Frederick G. Hochwalt, National Catholic Educational Association, *ex officio*; General Director Raymond F. McLain, Commission on Christian Higher Education, Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., *ex officio*.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND INDUSTRY: President Frank Hugh Sparks, Wabash College, *Chairman*; President Harold C. Coffman, George Williams College; President Russell D. Cole, Cornell College; President Nelson P. Horn, Baker University; President Frank A. Rose, Transylvania College; President Irwin J. Lubbers, Hope College; President Laurence M. Gould, Carleton College; President Franc L. McCluer, Lindenwood College; President David L. Crawford, Doane College; President Carter Davidson, Union College; President A. R. Keppel, Catawba College; President W. Terry Wickham, Heidelberg College; President John W. Raley, Oklahoma Baptist University; President Harry L. Dillin, Linfield College; President Robert C. Grier, Erskine College; President J. Clark Graham, Yankton College; President John L. McMahon, Our Lady of the Lake College; President Francis P. Gaines, Washington and Lee University; President C. Hoyt Watson, Seattle Pacific College; President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College; President R. T. L. Liston, King College.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: (1954) President William S. Carlson, State University of New York; President Francis X. N. McGuire, Villanova College; President Peyton N. Rhodes, Southwestern; (1955) Vice Chancellor LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University, *Chairman*; President R. McA. Lloyd, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association; President Ernest L. Wilkinson, Brigham Young University; (1956) President James P. Brawley, Clark College; President W. Bay Irvine, Marietta College; President Albert G. Parker, Jr., Hanover College.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS: (1954) President Walter C. Langsam, Gettysburg College; President G. Herbert Smith, Willamette University; President Charles H. Wesley, Central State College; (1955) President Wallace M. Alston, Agnes Scott College; President Jaime Benitez, University of Puerto Rico; President Edgar G. Gammon, Hampden-Sydney College; President William J. Scarborough, West Virginia Wesleyan College; President Gregg M. Sinclair, University of Hawaii; (1956) President Theodore M. Hesburgh, University of Notre Dame; Sister Mary Margaret, College of Notre Dame of Maryland; President Richard V. Moore, Bethune-Cookman College; President Robert D. Steele, Carroll College; President Paul Weaver, Lake Erie College.

COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION: (1954) President J. Seelye Bixler, Colby College; President Gordon K. Chalmers, Kenyon College; President Charles W. Cole, Amherst College; President Victor L. Butterfield, Wesleyan University; President Laurence M. Gould, Carleton College; (1955)

President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College; Dean Charles E. Odegard, University of Michigan; President Nathan M. Pusey, Harvard University, *Chairman*; President Richard D. Weigle, St. John's College (Maryland); President Duncan S. Ballantine, Reed College; (1956) John E. Everett, Hollins College; President Frederick Hard, Scripps College; President Howard B. Jefferson, Clark University; President William F. Quillian, Jr., Randolph-Macon Woman's College; President Celestin J. Steiner, University of Detroit.

COMMISSION ON MINORITY GROUPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: (1954) President Ambrose J. Burke, St. Ambrose College; President Alonzo G. Moron, Hampton Institute; President Anne Gary Pannell, Sweet Briar College; President G. Morris Smith, Susquehanna University; (1955) President Robert E. Burns, College of the Pacific; President Carlyle Campbell, Meredith College; President Bernhard Christensen, Augsburg College; Mother Eleanor M. O'Byrne, Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, *Chairman*; (1956) President George C. S. Benson, Claremont Men's College; President Edward B. Bunn, Georgetown University; President W. B. Guarrant, Austin College; President Robert P. Ludlum, Blackburn College.

COMMISSION ON PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION: (1954) President Samuel Belkin, Yeshiva University; President Laurence J. McGinley, Fordham University; President Robert F. Thompson, College of Puget Sound; (1955) President Mordecai W. Johnson, Howard University; President O. P. Kretzmann, Valparaiso University, *Chairman*; President James Roscoe Miller, Northwestern University; (1956) President Harold C. Case, Boston University; President Philip G. Davidson, Jr., University of Louisville; President John D. Williams, University of Mississippi.

COMMISSION ON PUBLIC RELATIONS: (1954) President Otto F. Kraushaar, Goucher College; President Franc L. McCluer, Lindenwood College; President John A. O'Brien, College of the Holy Cross; President Norman P. Auburn, University of Akron; (1955) President Doak S. Campbell, Florida State University; President Robert C. Grier, Erskine College; President Lincoln B. Hale, Evansville College; President M. Lafayette Harris, Philander Smith College; (1956) Brother J. Ambrose, St. Mary's College (Minnesota); President Waights G. Henry, Jr., La Grange College; President C. H. Marvin, George Washington University, *Chairman*; President Chester C. Maxey, Whitman College.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION: (1954) President Sister M. Columkille, Incarnate Word College; President William J. Dunne, University of San Francisco; President Hardy Liston, Johnson C. Smith University; President Lawrence M. Stavig, Augustana College, (S. Dak.); (1955) President Russell D. Cole, Cornell College, *Chairman*; President Paul H. Fall, Hiram College; President Evald B. Lawson, Upsala College; President John J. Theobald, Queens College (New York); (1956) President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; President Clark G. Kuebler, Ripon Col-

lege; President A. Howard Meneely, Wheaton College; President Maurice O. Ross, Butler University.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: (1954) Vice Chancellor LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University; President M. E. Sadler, Texas Christian University; (1955) President John R. Cunningham, Davidson College; Chancellor R. H. Fitzgerald, University of Pittsburgh; (1956) President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; Chancellor William P. Tolley, Syracuse University.

REPRESENTATIVES ON NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING: (1954) President Morgan S. Odell, Lewis and Clark College; Executive Director Guy E. Snively; (1955) President Bancroft Beatley, Simmons College; President Vincent J. Flynn, College of St. Thomas; (1956) President Cloyd H. Marvin, George Washington University; President M. E. Sadler, Texas Christian University.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*; The Vice President, *ex officio*; The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, October and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

*Annual Subscription Rates:* Regular \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each. Address the Association of American Colleges, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

THE BULLETIN will be available in 1954 in microfilm edition through University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

## CONTENTS

Editorial Notes .....	367
Colleges and Communism, <i>Cloyd H. Marvin</i> .....	377
Intellectual Freedom, <i>Arthur G. Coons</i> .....	384
The Good and Great for Company, <i>Stanley T. Williams</i> .....	386
College Admission and the Third Dimension, <i>Louis T. Benezet</i> .....	397
Fine Arts in a Christian College, <i>John O. Gross</i> .....	409
The Liberal Arts in Contemporary American Society, <i>George F. Kennan</i> .....	416
Attitudes of Sociologists Toward General Education, <i>Leo A. Haak</i> .....	424
University Programs for Labor and Management, <i>David Levinson</i> .....	431
Educational Goals for College Women, <i>Eleanor F. Dolan</i> .....	441
Pre-Legal Education .....	452
The Certification of Man, <i>Abram L. Sachar</i> .....	461
The College President, <i>Gus Turbeville</i> .....	464
Ten Commandments for Teachers, <i>W. H. McMaster</i> .....	465
Higher Education .....	466
Book Reviews:	
Philosophy of Education, <i>Hunter B. Blakely</i> .....	470
The Management of Universities, <i>Edward A. Fitzpatrick</i> .....	472
Among the Colleges .....	475
New College Presidents .....	478

## COLLEGE AND CHURCH

A Philosophy of Christian Higher Education, <i>William F. Quillian, Jr.</i> .....	481
Religious Emphasis Weeks:	
The Beginning of a Symposium, <i>William G. Ryan</i> .....	494
Pro and Con, <i>Donald M. Cleary</i> .....	495
The Program of Religious Emphasis Week, <i>Robert E. L. Bearden</i> .....	498
Planning Brings Results, <i>Phillips P. Moulton</i> .....	501
Editorial Items .....	505



## EDITORIAL NOTES

**THIS ISSUE OF THE BULLETIN** continues under the direction of the same editorial staff. The Board of Directors has not yet chosen a new Executive Director.

**PEOPLES COLLEGE—A HISTORY OF MISSISSIPPI STATE**—by Professor John K. Bettersworth delineates admirably the vicissitudes of a great Agricultural and Mechanical College founded just 75 years ago. In a way it was an evolution from the Agricultural, Horticultural and Botanical Society established in 1839 at Jefferson College, Mississippi's first state institution of higher learning.

The first president was Lieutenant General Stephen D. Lee, C.S.A., a native of Charleston, South Carolina, and a graduate of West Point, who had married in 1865 Regina Harrison of a prominent family in Columbus, Mississippi. After the war the General "attempted to operate" his wife's plantation and became an active leader in the Baptist Church and the Grange. The leaders of the latter group were largely instrumental in the organization of Mississippi State and for a number of years were its most loyal supporters. Notwithstanding opposition that can be easily understood, General Lee continued to invite to his faculty scholars from the North. He was a follower of the "new South" movement inspired by Henry Grady.

The Farmers' Alliance, in opposition to the support of the Grange, became violent critics of the Lee regime, as did leaders in the Populist Party which had considerable influence in the South in the latter part of the 19th century. After 20 years, General Lee retired to be succeeded early in 1899 by former Governor John M. Stone of Mississippi, who died in 1900. He was succeeded by President John Crumpton Hardy who had studied at Mississippi and Millsaps Colleges and Chicago and Cornell Universities. When Hardy became president of Baylor University in 1912 he was followed by George R. Hightower who had been president of the Farmers' Union in Mississippi. After four years of a turbulent presidency Hightower was succeeded by State Superintendent of Education, W. H. Smith, who had earned for himself the nickname of "Corn Club Smith." In

1920 with the inauguration of a new governor, David Carlisle Hull was chosen president. Hull had been on the faculty for a number of years and was an alumnus of the college. He retired in 1925 and was succeeded by another alumnus and fellow faculty member, Buz M. Walker. The record shows that Professor Francis P. Gaines of the English department, now president of Washington and Lee University, was the leader in the accreditation of the college and its election to membership in the Southern Association of Colleges.

In 1928 Theodore G. Bilbo became Governor of Mississippi and forthwith proceeded to interfere with the administration of the various state schools. On June 13, 1930, he "summarily fired" President Walker and also the presidents of the University of Mississippi and the State Teachers College. Hugh Critz, another alumnus, was appointed president by the governor. Promptly, the Southern Association, the American Medical Association, the American Association of Law Schools and other accrediting groups put these three Mississippi state institutions on probation.

The reviewer of this history was secretary-treasurer of the Southern Association at the time and was an active participant in the drama that resulted in the election of a new governor of Mississippi and the re-instatement of the state schools. In November 1934, George Duke Humphrey, another native Mississippian, became president after the Southern Association authorities were convinced that the laws recently passed by the State concerning appointment of trustees would tend to little or no interference from the governor. President Humphrey was responsible for a number of important salutary changes. He resigned in June 1945 to become president of the University of Wyoming. His successor was Dean Fred Tom Mitchell of Michigan State College, another alumnus, who has done much during the past eight years to improve the organization and standing of Mississippi State College.

**THE STORY OF CYRUS AND SUSAN MILLS** by Elias Olan  
James tells vividly and in a most interesting fashion the history of the founding and of the struggles of the early years of



Mills College. Like Mount Holyoke College, from which Mrs. Mills proudly claimed to have received the burning inspiration for the founding and upbuilding of the college, it had most difficult beginnings. Like many other of our proud older colleges it started as a preparatory school, evolving as a college in 1885 in Oakland from a secondary school founded in 1852 as a young ladies seminary at Benicia, California. Unusual indeed is the record of typical teachers and administrators as were Dr. and Mrs. Mills, having such financial success that they were able to accumulate around a half million dollars from various ventures, principally profits from the preparatory school, to turn over to an independent board of trustees. Cyrus Mills graduated in 1844 from Williams College where he had been a close friend of its famous president, Mark Hopkins. On finishing his course at Union Theological Seminary, he married Susan Lincoln Tolman, a graduate of Mount Holyoke College in the class of 1845. A teacher there for three years, she had become an ardent admirer of its founder, Mary Lyon. Shortly after their marriage in 1848, the Mills sailed for the Batticotta Mission in Ceylon. The health of Mrs. Mills deteriorated greatly in Ceylon so that they received permission from the American Board of Foreign Missions to return in 1855. After some preaching and a business venture, they took over the management of the Punahou School in Hawaii in 1860. In 1864 they were attracted to California where Mrs. Mills' health improved so that she lived to the ripe old age of eighty-six. Her distinguished husband had overworked himself so that he died in 1884 at the age of sixty-five.

Upon the death of Cyrus, Susan and the trustees of the now independent Mills Seminary agreed that it was time to step up the program to collegiate status and elect a man president. The record indicates that the first president chosen by the Board had some of the characteristics of a peacock. The Board insisted Mrs. Mills continue as a semi-independent business manager of the college. President Stratton resigned before the end of two years to accept the presidency of the University of North Dakota where his term of office was also brief. His successor was a Methodist minister who retired after three years during which there was considerable criticism of his amatory ambitions toward

some of the female faculty, which charge fortunately was not proven so that he could be assigned to a responsible religious post. Logically the Board then elected Mrs. Mills to the presidency, which she held from 1890 to 1909. She died in 1912.

The Mills Story concludes with the election of Luella Clay Carsons, Dean of Women of the University of Oregon, as the successor to Susan Tolman Mills in 1910. Author James has for more than 40 years been Professor of English at Mills College. He vividly portrays how Mrs. Susan Mills idealized Mary Lyon, also the inspiration received by Dr. Mills from his relationship with Mark Hopkins. The ardent love of Professor James for genealogy makes the first two chapters of the book slow reading. Stanford University Press, Stanford University, California.

**THE CHAIRMAN OF OUR COMMISSION ON LIBERAL EDUCATION** will have an enlarged opportunity in his new position as President of Harvard University to urge the importance of the liberal arts. Here is a brief quotation from the inaugural address Nathan M. Pusey gave on his installation in 1944 as President of Lawrence College:

I ask you, then, to think of education as a force of power in the world which has been there from the beginning and to which we must ascribe the order and achievement, the decency and the kindness which have produced that fragile but lovable plant we call civilization. For it is the role of education to give the fullest and finest direction to that urge which is the primary force in our lives. That is to say, it is the task of education perpetually to make the unreasonable reasonable, without destroying its strength, and to guide the aimless and powerful toward purpose, fulfillment and God's glory.

American education in its totality is addressed to Everyman, but there is a growing tendency to assume that this means that every man should be given every kind of education, or that we who are responsible for colleges should immediately get busy in an effort to devise a kind of education which could serve all the needs of all the young people of this country. I think it is time to point out that the liberal arts college is only a part of the educational machinery of the country, that it has a specific function to perform, and that it is only by the excellent performance of this that the college can best serve the needs of the whole.

Our job has always been to provide a broad and enlightening experience for those who can profit by it, and in doing this, to seek to provide for society a humanistic leadership which has gained competence for its task through specialized training informed by philosophical insight. . . . Our move is . . . to find ways to make this education available to all who have the capacity, and the will, to receive it. . . .

## CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR MEMBER PRESIDENTS

who received honorary degrees last commencement; particularly to President Eleanor M. O'Byrne, who has served so well as Chairman of our Commission on Minority Groups, whose presentation for the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters at New York University concluded with this appropriate statement:

With her soft southern accent enhancing a rich Celtic wit, Mother O'Byrne has an invincible advantage over the common tribe of academicians which she exercises with remarkable restraint. Deft deflater, nevertheless, of pedantic pomposity, peerless peeress among her presidential peers, who knits serenely as the tumbrels cart off many a less resilient colleague from academic heights, her brilliant mentality flashing from her somber habit is as a diamond set in jet.

**THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT** announces 12 scholarships at British universities, known as the Marshall Scholarships, given in appreciation of the United States' program for European recovery, to United States graduate students annually. Candidates must be under 28 years of age, United States citizens of both sexes, graduates of an accredited degree-granting college or university in the United States. The awards of about 550 pounds a year, higher for married students, are for two years, but may be extended to three. Applications for 1954 must be in by November 1, 1953, and should be made to the British Consulate-General in New York, New Orleans, Chicago or San Francisco, dependent upon where the applicant resides or has had at least two years of his college training. Appropriate forms will be sent him. Three scholarships will be awarded each year in each of the four regions. Preference will be given to high academic competence, combined with ability to play an active part in the university to which they go in the United Kingdom.

**E**ducational Testing Service is offering for 1954-55 its 7th series of research fellowships in psychometrics leading to the Ph.D degree at Princeton University. Open to men who are acceptable to the Graduate School of the University, the two fellowships each carry a stipend of \$2,500 a year and are normally renewable. Fellows will engage in part-time research in the general area of psychological measurement at the offices of the Educational Testing Service and will, in addition, carry a normal program of studies in the Graduate School. Competence in mathematics and psychology is a prerequisite. Information and application blanks will be available about November 1st from: Director of Psychometric Fellowship Program, Educational Testing Service, 20 Nassau Street, Princeton, New Jersey.

**E**RNEST L. KLEIN has written three recent studies on American capitalism and its role in world politics: "Our Appointment with Destiny," "How to Stay Rich" and "What of the Night?". Farrar, Straus & Young, New York.

**T**HE STUDY OF HUMAN NATURE by David Lindsay Watson is a plea for more knowledge of human nature, more self-knowledge by man in the present critical period in history and is thought-provoking to students in all fields. Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

**P**RIVATE SCHOOLS 1953 is a completely revised edition of the excellent Porter Sargent guide to preparatory schools, junior colleges and specialized schools. Information is given on specific curricula, scholarships and self-help opportunities, graduates and value of plants and endowments of 2,000 schools. Supplementary lists are also given of Latin American and foreign schools for United States boys and girls. Porter Sargent, 11 Beacon Street, Boston 8, Massachusetts.

**B**ULLETIN NOW ON MICROFILM! Through an agreement with University Microfilms the Association has made available to libraries the present and future volumes of the BULLETIN in microfilm form. The film copy is distributed only at the

end of the volume year. Under this plan, the library can use the printed issues, unbound, for circulation during the period of greatest demand. When the paper copies begin to wear out, or are not called for frequently, they are discarded and the microfilm is substituted. The microfilm is furnished on metal reels, suitably labeled. It is hoped that the cost will be approximately the same as for binding the same number of issues. Inquiries should be directed to University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

**THE ORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES** is a study prepared jointly by the American College Public Relations Association under the direction of Marvin W. Topping and the National Research Committee of the Public Relations Society of America with Walter G. Barlow as Chairman. The report gives interesting and timely tables and statistics on staffs, salary ranges, background and training of public relations officers in schools and colleges. Terse and explicit, this should be valuable to college administrators and students considering this field. The American College Public Relations Association, 726 Jackson Place N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

**THE RETIRED OFFICER** of The Retired Officers Association wishes to call attention to its membership, made up of retired administrators and educators from the Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health service, who are available for part-time academic or administrative employment. Their wide and varied experience and the fact that they have their retirement pay should make them helpful to the colleges. Educational organizations interested should write direct to the editor of *The Retired Officer*, 1616 Eye Street N.W., Washington 6, D. C. giving essential details concerning positions to be filled. Notices will then be published in the next issue and replies sent direct to the originator.

**FIVE THOUSAND WOMEN COLLEGE GRADUATES REPORT** is an analysis of the "findings of a national survey of the social and economic status of women graduates of liberal arts



colleges of 1946-1949" by Robert Shosteck, Director of Research of the B'nai B'rith Vocational Service Bureau, and is a unique and valuable study. It discusses their family background, religion, college major and relation to their career, as well as the percentage who marry and who go on with graduate work. Illustrated with many charts and tables, this research was conducted on the graduates of 150 accredited four year colleges and universities in various geographic areas. B'nai B'rith Vocational Service Bureau, Washington, D. C.

**MYTHOLOGY** gives the great stories from Greek, Roman and Norse legends retold in a simple, concise and entertaining fashion by Edith Hamilton, and is excellent for reference or entertainment. The New American Library of World Literature, New York.

**HIGHER EDUCATION LOOKS AHEAD, MOVING FORWARD WITH VOCATIONAL EDUCATION and BETTER EDUCATION FOR MORE PEOPLE** are bulletins published by the Minnesota Commission on Vocational and Higher Education and report the work of that Commission in the State of Minnesota.

**PRESIDENTS OF AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1952-53 Edition**, edited by Robert C. Cook, presents biographical data on 1,433 administrative heads of institutions of higher learning in the United States and is a unique reference book and help to those seeking information on executives of colleges, universities, teachers colleges, junior colleges and normal schools, that cannot be found in any other publication. Who's Who in American Education, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee.

**IMPROVING TRANSITION FROM SCHOOL TO COLLEGE** edited by Arthur E. Traxler and Agatha E. Townsend is derived from a study compiled by the Committee on School and College Relations of the Educational Records Bureau and examines procedures of college admissions and secondary school curricula. Harper & Brothers, New York.

**THE CROWDED AIR** by Dr. Roger Manvell, an eminent British authority on film, radio and television, compares television in America and Britain, analyzing the advantages and disadvantages of public service and privately sponsored broadcasting, describing the power and future of the television medium. Channel Press, New York.

**SCHOLAR'S WORKSHOP** by Kenneth J. Brough traces the growth and development of four of the greatest university libraries in the United States—Chicago, Columbia, Harvard and Yale—and discusses the nature and functions of large research libraries. Written by the librarian at San Francisco State College this analysis should especially interest librarians and college administrators. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois.

**STUDY ABROAD, 1952-53, Volume V**, continues the handbook of UNESCO showing opportunities for studying in other countries, listing fellowship programs and training programs around the world.

**TRAINING ABROAD** gives facilities for educational travel and pertinent information thereto; published annually by UNESCO, Paris.

"IN AN EFFORT TO MEET ITS SHARE OF THE RESPONSIBILITY for aiding college education in the 14 Middle-western states in which Standard Oil Company (Indiana) markets directly, the directors of the Company have decided to set up a fund of \$150,000 to be available for distribution during 1953. This fund will be allocated on an equitable basis among the 14 Middlewestern states which have organized, or may properly organize such state associations, and aid over 100 different colleges. If the experience proves to be satisfactory, the Company hopes that such grants will be continued in subsequent years, but that will be a matter for the decision of the Board each year in the light of all circumstances. It is recognized that the different state associations above referred to differ in their standards for the inclusion of institutions and have different formulae for dividing undesignated gifts. The Company feels that the state

associations should include only those liberal arts colleges maintaining high-quality, four-year programs, but in general the Company expects to accept the standards and distribution plans agreed upon by the individual associations. The Company also expects to continue to finance the 23 graduate fellowships, mainly in science and engineering, which it has allocated in the past among the graduate schools, and the undergraduate scholarships initiated last year among the 14 Middlewestern liberal arts colleges which had an outstanding record in the undergraduate training of chemists."

Excerpt of statement on "Industry and the Private Liberal Arts Colleges" by Robert E. Wilson, Chairman of the Board, Standard Oil Company of Indiana.

**I**F YOU DO NOT HAVE a copy of "Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges" (436 pp.) by Edward Safford Jones, of the 1933 vintage to be sure but still an informative summary, you may now have it for 75 cents (original price \$2.50). Send your order with check directly to this office for prompt attention.



## COLLEGES AND COMMUNISM

CLOYD H. MARVIN

PRESIDENT, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

**I**T IS our hope that, in the years you have been with us, you have gained strengths which will enable you to be even tempered in the midst of the present world frenzy, and to continue to regard learning now challenged by unashamed social stupidity. It is our hope that the disciplines which you have acquired will bring to you strength and faith. May you, in seeking mental and spiritual attainments learn that all men have similar aspirations, some on one plane, some on another.

If the education you have were available to all men and women, the problems confronting mankind would be answered far more readily. Education proposes to answer these problems through humanizing the purposes of life, through maturing understanding, and through refining emotional reactions. So, education has been, and will continue to be, the means of realizing effective methods and of building hopes in our democratic society. Through education, founded on the cultures of the world, men shall be able to achieve compatibility among the aims of the many who make up our Nation, and the millions who make up the world. Our Nation, as is the case of all nations who believe in popular sovereignty, is the result of collective choices, and such are reached voluntarily, beginning with the formulation of our Constitution.

Today there are some who charge that there are members in our colleges and universities who have forgotten the ideals of our democratic ways. They charge that in some instances our institutions of higher learning do not support the ideals of our forebears, as recorded in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of our Nation. They say that some of the membership of our colleges and universities, if not actually following, are leaning toward the tenets of totalitarianism. They say that some of our membership do not believe that self-im-

NOTE: An address delivered to the graduating Class of 1953 of The George Washington University.

posed educational disciplines will create strength to meet and overcome the state-imposed exactions of totalitarianism. They say that there are those in the colleges and universities who insist upon a personal freedom to advance totalitarian beliefs even unto the destruction of our form of government.

Communism arrives at what it knows as freedom through the commitment of the individual to an objective or to a cause. This procedure fails to square with the best knowledge of psychology, anthropology or social science. Once the communistic idea is established within the state the rights of individuals, who are at variance with the pattern or any part of it, must be ruthlessly sacrificed. Communism has little regard for individual initiative and finds salvation only in collectivism.

Such a position is the antithesis of the spirit of individuality in which democracy believes. It is in concord that democratic men find what may seem at first the less certain, but what in reality is the more certain, way of democracy. Men are never so sure of the way as when they prove it, plodding together step after step. Under the democratic regime the rules of the game and the idea of fair play make certain that every man has his chance. Under communism, if there be any rules of the game, they are constantly changed to take temporary advantage of whatever opportunities come into being. Conventional laws of conduct are forgotten. The variances in objectives and the aberrations in the methods of communism make it difficult for democracy to meet totalitarianism in an effective way.

Democracy is trying to work out a way of dealing with the communists. This is made manifest by the rulings in the communist trials in New York, the false treaty interpretations of Yalta and Potsdam, and now the some-time bungling of the investigating committee set up by the Congress. Democracy learns slowly, but it learns well. Communism's immediacy is temporarily effective, but the slow democratic process creates the most versatile and resourceful agencies that the world has known.

The totalitarian mind is a molded mind, as well as a subservient mind. The ultimate patterns are set by the oligarchal mentors. The fine arts cannot be contaminated by foreign ideologies; music must meet certain communistic concepts, and no others, or the composers will be called for an accounting; biology

is made to serve communistic ideologies,—“Stalin’s Theory” of acquired characteristics in biological growth is spoken through the mouth of a professor; theology cannot be accepted because God is beyond the State.

Insofar as man’s mind can be said to be free under communism, that freedom is so circumscribed that the mind is stultified, becomes limited in method and fixed by ideology. Leaders in communism have a philosophic authority of their own making to support them. In contrast, leaders in the democratic way must reinterpret beliefs as the experiences of men dictate. In a democracy men eagerly search for truth. They formulate new methods and judgments. Creative intelligence takes the place of formalized activity. Leaders in the democratic way must interpret beliefs as experience demands. Their minds are constantly in flux. The strength of democracy is found in the creative power of the individual.

We have before us, then, a comparison: the objectives of communism are met upon demand, while democracy cannot set up immediate objectives because both aims and methods must grow out of the minds of men. So, at any given time, there is likely to be a time lag in the settlement of problems when we compare the length of time it takes to develop the objectives of democracy, and put in force the settled aims of communism. Our people have not yet fully analyzed the meaning of this lag. It has in it uncertainties and discomforts. Because of it, it seems that communism might prevail because of its seeming efficiency, and democracy might lose because it cannot move fast enough.

At this point fear enters our life. We distrust totalitarianism actively but we often distrust ourselves the more. We distrust our way of meeting our adversities. Communism seems strong in one engagement. We forget that the means of winning one battle does not win the war. Men under totalitarianism act blindly. Men in a democracy see and prove all things as they progress. Of necessity they move with caution as they unfold uncertainties, and fears are put aside. Our men, who know creativeness and have faith, believe in this democratic way which cannot be challenged because it is the invention of free minds. It is dependent upon the maintenance of the worth of the individual. Communists believe in things and forms. These can

be challenged. In our democratic land God is the God of things spiritual. The people of our Nation believe that government has its basis in something far deeper than its own forms. Governmental concepts are based on God-given rights of man and the reality of purpose in our universe.

Again I say: this was the belief of our forefathers, which was declared in the Declaration of Independence, and in the Constitution. They wrote on our money, "In God We Trust." The people of our Nation talk of belief while the communist world talks of ideas. Communistic ideas can be challenged. Democratic beliefs cannot be,—nor can they be defended. They are of our life itself. It is my belief that the materialistic concepts of communism will fade away before the spiritual elements of democratic beliefs.

Our colleges and universities have this faith. They recognize their responsibilities to our Nation. Our colleges and universities are chartered by the State. They are training leaders who know the democratic way of bringing about concord,—concord resulting from a struggle for choice. It is such concord that means progress in our Republic.

Communism disturbs our colleges and universities because it perturbs our Nation. Our people's attitude toward communism is a base from which to raise the question of the freedom of our way of life and of our institutions of higher learning. From this base we ask certain questions concerning academic freedom as it affects the membership of our colleges and universities.

Our political leaders, particularly sensitive to "the creeping in" of communistic doctrine in our land, are undertaking to find out if our universities do foster communism. On the basis of academic freedom their right to do this has been questioned. The officials of our Government, if they believe that the faculties of the colleges and universities are not representing the best ideals of our people, have the right to look into our academic procedures and to know the personnel which support the educational programs.

This is the basis for the above statement: The colleges and universities receive their charters from the people through their legally constituted state, and thus make their institutions responsible to their Government. The appeal for academic im-

munity is sometimes an historical one. But in this argument we find qualifications to the statement that the colleges or universities have been traditionally free. Even in the 12th and 13th centuries these institutions, which we usually think of as autonomous, were under the dominance of the Church. From these early days on, as I mention university names, Goettigen, Berlin, Bonn, the University of Paris, Moscow, Cracow, Oxford and Cambridge, you will recognize that they, in various ways, supported the State in which they were chartered. By the end of the 19th century, as far as Europe was concerned, the colleges and universities were subordinate to the State. They served as a voice of the national mind and they took unto themselves the dissemination of such knowledge.

American colleges and universities found their beginnings in these backgrounds and made themselves responsible through religious or public auspices for helping to develop national ideals. So, our own institutions, deriving their authority from the people through the State, are happy they have this responsibility, and, in accepting it, have imposed certain limitations upon themselves. These limitations should be recognized by those who teach.

Recently a committee of the Congress has undertaken to find whether there is an infiltration of communists into the faculties of our colleges and universities, and if so, how deeply have they penetrated. The discussion resulting from this study has raised the following questions:

What do we do about the professors who, we find, are members of the Communist Party?

What do we do about professors who, at one time, were members of the Communist Party and have withdrawn from membership and have repudiated their former beliefs?

Should a professor, called to testify before a committee of the Congress, and who believes in academic freedom, appeal to the amendments to the Constitution of the United States in order to protect himself from self incrimination?

Should communism be taught in our institutions of higher learning by a communist so that the subject could be taught in a realistic way by an authority of the party?

Before attempting to answer these questions, I say to you that there is no doubt about the legal rights of an individual,



in this instance the professor, to claim his constitutional right of not incriminating himself. But the answers to the question at once go beyond the legal position to the moral standards of our society.

To return to the four questions which I shall consider briefly, in the order given. What of the professor who is an avowed communist? If a professor believes in the violent overthrow of this government of ours, and hence does not accept the responsibility of upholding the fundamental ideals of our state, he is a traitor to the State from which he accepts privileges; and, he cannot support the program of the institution which hires him for he does not believe in its objectives. He will teach in accordance with the doctrines imposed by the Communist Party; hence his learning is limited and he cannot have a free mind. Such a person should not be allowed to teach in our institutions of higher learning.

What do we do about professors who have at one time been communists or fellow travelers, and, having seen the error of their ways, want to be protected in their classroom privileges and obligations?

In a democracy a man has the right to change his mind, and he should be protected in this right. But a college or university, in employing or continuing to employ a man who has been a communist, should make sure that he has given up his communist membership and affiliations, and that his mind has been purged of totalitarianism and rebuilt so that he can feel the significance of, as well as state, the tenets of democracy. Some provision, other than teaching should be made to give such persons an opportunity in which to prove themselves. Classroom opportunities can be reestablished after the proving.

What about the professor who refuses to testify before a Congressional committee because of his basic belief in academic freedom, and thus incriminates by association himself and his institution?

Society has a right to know of how and what the professor thinks and teaches. There are those who think that this raises the question of the invasion of academic freedom. This challenge presupposes that there is an acceptable social definition of academic freedom. It is questionable if such a definition exists;

but, if it does, and the definition is impinged upon by making a statement, then it must be decided whether the action is in the public interest. No man lives unto himself,—he is responsible to his colleagues and his neighbor.

From whatever angle one may desire to look upon the individuals who make up a faculty of a college or university, one must return to the concept that the professor is a public servant, along with the minister or priest, who dedicates his life to help in the development of men and women. Because he is a public servant and because he holds such a vital position, the people (especially his colleagues) have a right to know not only what his immediate convictions are, but also those that he has held before, so that they may know how he arrived at his current beliefs.

Truthfulness and a regard for exactness are marks of the professor. It would seem, then, that the professor would want the truth known about himself and would gladly state his position so that his colleagues, his institution and society would be informed.

Some days ago, a professor, in speaking before a group of club women, tried to be "very academic" by saying that the true academic way of teaching communism is to have the subject taught by a person sympathetic to it. Therefore, communism should be taught by a communist, and our students should have the privilege of sitting under such a teacher. The fallacy of this theory is that a communist is so bound by his own doctrines that he cannot possibly know of its relationship to other social and political philosophies and its proper place in the world.

Students must have opportunities of knowing about communism as they know about other social or political theories that are not of democracy.

The problems communism brings to the world are many. Interestingly enough it causes many problems for itself. It has created the very limitations that will weaken and finally destroy it. Communism cannot reckon with time.

## INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM

ARTHUR G. COONS

PRESIDENT, OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE

**S**OME people whom we would otherwise believe to be possessed of moderation have been drawn into the extreme right wing which seems to believe that all colleges are now devoted to the intellectual left, have determined to embrace collectivist teaching and have abandoned historic American principles and ideals.

I would argue that we should embrace and mediate all our best civic and economic and moral ideals. This is a time calling for rededication, renewed commitment to the basic goals and the moral and intellectual concerns of liberal education. I invite the counsel of all members of this household on how we may gird ourselves for maintaining the integrity of what we do, and how we may make this college strong, free, useful and great.

It is of the first importance that this college serve you,—its household and its constituency, our community and our nation,—in the achievement of the finest, truest aspirations and ideals. It is for this that we exist. We want to help you keep this nation free and strong and great and able to serve mankind. We want to help you realize a culture that is free and Christian as well as practical. We wish to treasure the best in everything that the race has known and aid youth, as well as all of you, in the enjoyment of the satisfactions that learning and science and art and letters may bring. We know that you are interested in what a college can do for young men and women as a dynamic center of creative intellectual and moral purpose. We believe we know where we are striving to go but we know also that the destiny of this college is in your hands, as well as in ours. We are but the current trustees for you in the preservation of the great heritage we have received and which we believe you desire we should refine and transmit.

Although financial aspects of the college give me very deep concern, I am more deeply troubled in my soul over the status in the total American scene today of the kind of education which

NOTE: This is an excerpt from Annual Report for 1951-52.



this college has represented and now represents. Perhaps this concern is a by-product of the tension of this particular year but I do not really think so. It is the product of influences of long standing in our land which are operating now to stifle if not kill the voice of liberal education. These influences are predominantly emanating from two main sources: revolution and reaction.

The cause of liberal learning, of free scholarship and free teaching is our cause. We have never had any other. Our motivations have been broadly Christian and humanistic, in line with the noblest, the finest traditions of our civilization and our culture. Yet this cause is being attacked by well-organized groups and voices representing either revolution on the extreme left or reaction on the extreme right and it appears that we may be ground between them if public opinion becomes dominated by these two antithetical unreasoning, unreasonable groups.

It is now being made to appear that any liberal voice is a revolutionary voice, that any concern for historic recognized virtues is a reactionary voice.

It is now alleged that any deviation from a full embrace of either extreme, stems from a sympathy with the opposite extreme.

Liberality in learning means several things but at least these:

1. Freedom within a sense of social responsibility.
2. Generous attitudes towards those who hold differing views within a context of continued pursuit of truth, and the maintenance of freedom and a free society, a certain kindly tolerance towards those urging a logic that differs with one's own without personal recrimination and mere *argumentum ad hominem*.
3. A concern for human progress in mind, spirit, morals and material well-being.

## THE GOOD AND GREAT FOR COMPANY: OUR LITERARY HERITAGE

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

STERLING PROFESSOR OF AMERICAN LITERATURE, YALE UNIVERSITY

ONE day this spring at the close of my lecture on the poetess, Emily Dickinson, a student stopped to speak to me. He was a fine-looking boy, and for a moment I cherished the fond hope that he had paused to discuss with me the poetry of Miss Dickinson. Instead, he said abruptly: "Now about this required essay in the course—?" "Yes?" I said, concealing my disappointment. "When is it due?" I told him. "At what time on that day?" "Oh," I said, "say, twelve o'clock." "How many pages?" he continued. "Oh," I said, "six or seven. The length depends upon your interest." "How many words?" he added, and then before I could answer, "single space or double space?" "Well, anyway," he concluded, "I think I'll drop the course." We have all had these moments in teaching, at once tragic and humorous. Sometimes as I look out from the platform at my 125 young men, all their faces say as eloquently as if they spoke in unison: "Oh, please, don't lecture to us today."

Such incidents as this one after my class endear the American undergraduate to us all. Often I think that I would not have him otherwise. He is one of the most delightful individuals in the world. I see him on the football field, wearing that armor which transforms him to a giant and which makes, by comparison, the equipment of a medieval knight seem negligible. I see him in the college dining-hall, wearing a coat and necktie,—but by compulsion. I see him at the college parties, a little condescending to the old professor but still utterly charming. Surely the American undergraduate, friendly, hopeful, full of life and spirits, is one of our best friends. He inspires in us confidence in the future of our country. It is a privilege to teach him (if we can); to educate him; to try to make him a better man than his father.

NOTE: Commencement address at Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey, June 8, 1953.

Nevertheless, my young friend did not wish to write an essay, and though there may have been other reasons, it seems to me significant that he renounced the only creative act in one of our large courses, which under the lecture system are so sadly limited in expression. In him was, I am sure, a distinct antipathy for the intellectual life for its own sake. There have been breath-taking advances made in our university curricula since I was one of these same undergraduates, but I was sensible in him, as I was in myself at his age, of a lack of enthusiasm for intellectual effort for itself. If he may be said to be myself in a new generation, then here was one advance not yet accomplished. He would study to pass a course, to receive a credit, to satisfy a passing interest,—yes. But to master even one foreign language, to absorb completely one literature, to train himself to think clearly in the vocabulary of ideas, especially if no professional career lay ahead,—this kind of intellectual passion I do not think too unusual among our undergraduates. At a recent Phi Beta Kappa dinner, the president confided to me that many of the newly-elected members had chosen courses which would not be too difficult. They thought a Phi Beta Kappa key would be useful in business. Nor has the ideal of learning much prestige in the world. The fact of having been exposed to these influences is sometimes regarded with suspicion.

For in America we do not take the world of intellectual disciplines too seriously. Perhaps you are different. Perhaps Upsala College is an exception. I know it is different at another Upsala,\* to whose faculty I was attached for a term. Here is a society quite as democratic as ours in which learning both within and without the classroom is deeply respected. I was urged to read in the classroom the notes from my research. The notion seemed to be that if the students could not understand this material, unenlivened and unpopularized, it was their misfortune. While I was at Upsala the Russians put some of the professors at the University of Prague in jail. There ensued a demonstration of sympathy at Upsala for the professors of the sister university. I know a university where there was a demonstration recently, but it was for a beer party, not for the profes-

\* Upsala University, Sweden.

sors. Indeed, if I find myself in jail, I am not sure there would not be demonstrations of joy. But, seriously, the protest at Upsala in behalf of Prague was based on the affront to learning. Learned men should not be put in prison. There are athletes and athletics at Upsala, and I am bound to say gayer parties than I have ever seen in the United States. I found, too, that the attendance in my classes was to depend upon the fall of snow, that is, upon the opportunities for skiing. Nevertheless, these young men, many of them with practical vocations before them, could speak several languages and knew half the literatures of Europe.

But I wish to speak only incidentally of Europe. What I have to say this morning concerns America, and you and me, as Americans. At the same time, in my lecturing and teaching in Europe I have never experienced the particular feeling that I have so often about American undergraduates, that intellectual effort is merely the means to an end. Here the end is usually the degree, the diploma, the sheepskin, the Phi Beta Kappa key. One thinks of the contrast in the independent, intellectual Henry David Thoreau. I do not think there are many of us who, like Thoreau, a scholar in a dozen fields, put intellectual achievement above the rewards of intellectual achievement. I am sure my intentions were not so pure when I sought a B.A. I meant to become a teacher, and I thought the degree meant a job. Though it is dangerous to generalize, I think the situation differs in America from that in Europe.

The fact is that in these older civilizations this respect for things of the intellect has seeped down from the professions (scholars, teachers, writers) into that person whom we call "the man in the street." When I was about your age and lived for a year in Paris, I was amazed to see the long lines of poor people waiting to obtain admission (on an evening of reduced prices called *pour les pauvres*) to see a play by Molière or Racine. In France and England, in all the strata of life, exists this respect for the classic writers of their own countries. Some of you may recall that when Robert Frost, young and unknown, was in London, in search of a publisher for his first volume of poems, a policeman was equal to this emergency and told him where to go. Last year in a graduate course at Yale which contained many

foreign students, I became acutely aware of an Italian's knowledge of Dante and of a Scot's intimacy with Robert Burns. A current report on the life of the people in Russia describes them in subways or on streetcars reading their own great writers, Turgenev and Tolstoi.

What would similar surveys in our own country show: *The Naked and the Dead*? Micky Spillane? *Time*? *Look*? *Quick*? Am I deceived about this difference? I think not. In Europe also are mental laziness, fads of the moment, vulgarity and materialism. But contempt for the intellectual life in itself is, I believe, less discernible. If, then, it is true that both in my time and in yours there may be detected in America this strain of anti-intellectualism, that is, a skepticism regarding intellectual effort for its own sake in the great disciplines of history, science, philosophy, *literature*, what are the reasons? Incidentally, if I limit the manifestations of anti-intellectualism to literature it is because I lack time. But what is true of literature is equally true of the other subjects. I choose literature as an example partly because it is my stock in trade (I am a professor of English), but also because anti-intellectualism is never so striking as in its rebellion against great literature. But to return, why is there in America this fear of the intellectual life?

The first reason which comes to mind is that something is wrong with our methods of education. Yet if something is wrong, it is not from want of effort. Each year we spend upon our 170,000 elementary and high schools almost six billion dollars, and the staffs of these schools number more than 900,000 teachers. As college students you do not need to be reminded of the vastness, the complexity and the expense of our thousands of state and endowed universities. In Sweden, Upsala University is one of only four universities; in the United States our Upsala or Yale is one of thousands of institutions. We are proud, too, of our schools. Yet even now there is a tempest raging about their faults. I have just been reading a powerful indictment of our methods written by an old friend of mine. It is called "Anti-Intellectualism in the Schools: A Challenge to Scholars." This manifesto, published on December 29, 1952, was the subject of wide comment in the press. Professor Arthur Bestor, Professor of History at the University of Illinois, after



summarizing the blessings of the student of today (better teachers, more personal attention, superb equipment) accuses the schools of debasing the intellectual disciplines by featherbed teaching: instruction in "adjustment to life," in "saleable skills," in "playing party games." Though the true aim of our schools should be to provide intellectual training, they have not done so. In fact, in some cases they have even inspired contempt for the intellectual life.

This may or may not be true. It is not the first time we have heard the schools criticized for vocationalizing their purposes, and we have all known of the university where the student may prepare himself directly for his livelihood by courses in ice-cream making or in advanced concrete mixing, depending on his tastes (if I may use the metaphor). It does not matter too much at the moment. Our problem this morning is not a study of anti-intellectualism in school or college, but, in this brief discussion, the state of our consciousness, which we all share, of the inherent anti-intellectualism in all our minds. In this connection the anti-intellectualism in the schools and colleges is not unimportant, but it is merely one aspect of our psychological twist, the "small satanic kink," as the poet Robinson would call it.

What are the other aspects? Besides the utilitarian character of our education, there is our past. There is the historical aspect. The founding of the Republic, now 177 years old, has been a long and difficult task. We have developed a democratic society. We have mastered the frontier. We have explored the resources of the continent. We have resolved some of our political and social conflicts in an incredibly vast country. We have maintained a national unity. These practical achievements have made us a practical people. Looking back, we see the beginnings of this practical temper in the epithets which the seventeenth century Puritans gave to their leaders. They called one of these "The Founder of Towns," or another, "The Clearer of Wildernesses." In the eighteenth century there was the long war for freedom, with the odds terribly against us. In this same time Benjamin Franklin, who helped so much to win this war, came to represent this practical American point of view.

We find this practicality in the portrait of the self-made American in his *Autobiography* or in his maxims of "Poor Richard":

Early to bed, early to rise, makes a man happy, healthy and wise.

An empty bag will not stand upright.

A small leak will sink a great ship.

A penny saved is a penny earned.

If your head is wax, don't stay in the sun.

Here are all the exhortations which are so useful in business, but for deeper needs of life,—so empty. In the nineteenth century this practical talent of ours for founding a nation received its most harrowing test in the Civil War. But the well-built Republic survived. It freed the slaves. It consolidated the Union. It forged ahead to the world-leadership of today. In such a struggle, the immediate and practical strained every nerve. There was little time for the intellectual life. Franklin was thankful that he "escaped being a poet." And in so saying he undoubtedly spoke for millions of Americans.

A third aspect of our growing anti-intellectualism, especially in the nineteenth century, was our false estimate of what an American literature should be. Aghast at this materialism, the Americans who had literary talent (Irving, Longfellow or Lowell) fled to Europe for their inspiration. Our literature was shamelessly imitative, and destitute of real intellectual content of its own. This dependence on Europe aroused contempt concerning our literature:

In the four quarters of the globe [wrote an English critic in 1820], who reads an American book? or goes to an American play? or looks at an American picture or statue?

Not only was literary opinion half-Europeanized, but it stupidly failed to recognize our own men of genius. Our attitude drove Poe to a drunkard's grave. It ignored the remarkable experiment in living of Thoreau at Walden Pond. It was so hostile to our greatest novelist, Herman Melville, that he ceased to write. He said that though he wrote in the language of Saint Paul in this country, he would die in the gutter. Henry James, who described America as a place where the artist was gasping for air, took out British citizenship, and in our day his example has been followed by our most remarkable living poet, Thomas Stearns Eliot.

Thus the three aspects of our life (our education, our practical history, our conception of a native literature) have conspired to

create a mood of anti-intellectualism. Let me speak very briefly of two others, and so complete this summary. One of these two, or the fourth in our list of five, was the appearance of writers who were openly anti-intellectual. We think of Walt Whitman, setting up in type his *Leaves of Grass* with his own hand, and denouncing all the traditions of the past, and all "collegers" (as he called us). We think of Mark Twain, who ridiculed the arts in half a dozen books (the sculptor, Phidias; the painter, Raphael; the musician, Wagner; and all literature of a subtle or symbolic nature). He alluded to Henry James' novels as "feathers" and persistently called James himself "Henrietta." He made fun of Hawthorne's beautiful analyses of Puritanism, and he never failed to deride Jane Austen. Any library, he once declared, was a good library which did not contain the novels of Jane Austen. In his masterpiece, *Huckleberry Finn*, there is a running fire of satire on history and the languages. His derision of foreign languages was received with howls of delight by his American readers. He was continually angered by the habit in the German language of suspension, of the delay of the verb until the end. In answer to the question: "How do you like the German novel you are reading?" he replied, "I don't know. I haven't got to the verb yet." French comes in for an indictment in *Huckleberry Finn*:

"Why, Huck doan' de French people talk de same way we does?"

"No, Jim, you couldn't understand a word they said—not a single word."

"Well, now, I be ding-busted! How do dat come?"

"I don't know; but it's so. I got some of their jabber out of a book. S'pose a man was to come to you and say Polly-voo-franzy—what would you think?"

"I wouldn't think nuffin; I'd take en bust him over de head—dat is, ef he warn't white. I wouldn't 'low no nigger to call me dat."

"Shucks, it ain't calling you anything. It's only saying, do you know how to talk French?"

This is delightful, but beneath it lies Mark Twain's unconquerable distrust of the world of books and learning.

Finally, in this society we must glance at our entertainments, which like everything in our society are standardized and violent.



I am thinking of our fantastic means of communication, through the theatre, moving pictures, radio, television, photographs, pulp magazines, books, cartoons and comic strips. These are called, I believe, "mass media," and they are always with us. All day long and all night long they bombard us: the six o'clock news; the six-thirty program; the seven o'clock music; the early show; the late show; the show of shows. In his provocative book, *The Lonely Crowd*, David Riesman speaks of the readers of the past, those "inner directed" persons, and of us who are "other-directed." That is, instead of depending upon communication with the great of the past through books, we are influenced by this hodgepodge of print and talk from our contemporaries. When we think of these "mass media" we understand why the great books are less frequently read. We are all busy keeping up with *Time*, *Look* and *Quick*. We are all slaves of what is called "Reader-Interest."

I do not wish you to think I am drawing a gloomy picture of our cultural situation. On the contrary, it is because I believe that our real intellectual life is singularly rich that I am troubled by these five aspects of anti-intellectualism. Nor am I suggesting that young men and women at your time of life give yourselves to an arid intellectualism. Books are a dry substitute for life. In fact, as I have suggested, anti-intellectualism is connected, as in the cases of Walt Whitman and Mark Twain, with the freshness and vigor of American life. I once knew a student who could quote all of Milton's *Lycidas*, but you would not have admired his mind. Indeed, I thought there was something a little pathetic about my young Swedish friends in Upsala, with their fierce intellectual zeal. When I appeared in the classroom they rose at attention. During the lecture this rigid attention continued. I missed the cheerfulness, flexibility of mind and even the unaffected boredom of our students.

I am not exhorting you to be bookworms but to pursue in your leisure some phase of the intellectual life for its own sake. I have tried to suggest a fault in our American civilization. The wise individual, says Arnold Bennett, corrects in himself the faults of his country and of his age. It doesn't matter much what this area of the intellectual life is, if it is only an end in itself: history, science, architecture, music or literature. The

British statesman, Lord Grey, spent his leisure on Greek literature. Winston Churchill and Dwight Eisenhower are painters. It is impossible to do such things without some awareness of the intellectual traditions of the past.

But the best corrective, I do believe, of this fault of our civilization would be in our leisure to attempt a mastery of our own cultural past, of, specifically, the literature of our own country. By book collecting, by a little writing, by reading, to know our own masters of classic literature. As the Norwegian knows Ibsen, the German, Goethe, the Italian, Dante, the Englishman, Shakespeare, so we might know Emerson, Hawthorne, Thoreau, Melville or Emily Dickinson. Without minimizing what European literatures can do for us, there is in these writers of our own, something particularly enriching. Through Emerson we live again in the most intellectual expression of our nineteenth century civilization. Through Hawthorne we sense the importance of Puritanism in American history. From Melville we experience again the great era of our merchant marine. All such studies reveal the splendor of the story of our literature, and help us to understand our country in ways which Shakespeare, Goethe and Moliere, for all their greatness, cannot possibly offer us.

This story is varied and colorful. I have given 30 years of my life to it, and find it as fascinating as ever. But I have another reason for urging you to know it better. Let me put it this way. All of these writers seemed linked, despite their differences, in a singular unity. Each tried to go behind this outward world of America to its inner meanings. The Nature of which Emerson wrote, the countryside of New England, became for him a "lovely apparition," a vision of God. At Walden Pond, Thoreau was aware of a Presence animating the life of the woods and fields. Hawthorne showed the Scarlet Letter in the sky as the symbol of an unseen world. And, of course, *Moby Dick* is not just a tale of whaling. The White Whale stands for a complex pattern of Nature, Evil and of God Himself. Thus to know these writers intimately is to expose oneself not only to the pageant of America but to the deepest spiritual experience of the most imaginative minds of our past. These minds reveal the range and the depth of American specu-

lative thought. You should know the spiritual adventures of these minds. Though Whitman was in some ways anti-intellectual he expressed this with fervor:

I hail [he said] with joy the oceanic, variegated, intense practical energy, the demand for facts, even the business materialism of the current age, our States. But woe to the age or land, in which these things, movements, stopping at themselves, do not tend to ideas. As fuel to flame, and flame to the heavens, so must wealth, science, materialism—even this democracy of which we make so much—unerringly feed the highest mind, the soul. Infinitude the flight: fathomless the mystery.

The thought comes: why these older writers? Why not Dreiser, Lewis, Anderson, Hemingway, Faulkner, Steinbeck and the modern poets? I answer: Because these are not yet proven. Brilliance of technique and vivid recording of our modern world are for our precious leisure not enough. There is something lacking, namely affirmation, faith, belief in God. Some of us believe that they are nearer to the materialistic than the spiritual America. There is a curious metaphor running throughout modern American literature, and especially in the poetry of Eliot: the search for water in a dry land. Some of you will recall how Isaac, going down into the land of Gerar found the wells clogged, but dug, deep, deep down into the old soil and found the springing water.

You will say that this is a roundabout way of saying that we should know the literature of our fathers. But I think it worth saying in this way. In these writers a man may find the spiritual life which in our best moments we know to have been the psychic essence of our country. For there are two Americas. There is the America of "aggressive enterprise," to use Santayana's phrase. In an informal talk by the English poet, W. H. Auden, I was much interested, as he summarized the differences in the European and the American cultures, in what he said of money. In Europe money, he said, meant freedom, ease in which to do what one wished (travel, read, enjoy leisure). In America, money was a sign of achievement. If one made money, he had proved himself a man. It had a value in itself. This is the America which Emerson described as "great, avaricious, sensual America," and of which he said:

The mind of this country, taught to aim at low objects, eats upon itself.

It is the America which is all about us, whose mission, as one European said, seems to be to vulgarize the world.

Then there is the other America, which in spite of this strain of anti-intellectualism in us, we should know better, just as we should know the inner, not merely the outer, life of a dear friend. This is the America of the religious thinker, the historian, the novelist, the poet, the painter, the musician, the architect. A great tradition of mind and spirit beckons to us, from Jonathan Edwards (not Benjamin Franklin) to Robert Frost (not Ernest Hemingway). These are like the "cloud of witnesses" described in the Bible. Emerson, speaking to the young American who wishes to know *this* America, says that he has all about him

the shades of all the good and great for company . . . and for work the study and the communication of principles, the making those instincts prevalent, the conversion of the world.

Our lives are short. The generations of college students, like the generations of mankind, move swiftly through their few years of preparation. We all have glimpses during the few years of "the good and great." They are like gods with whom we have a somewhat lonely, momentary, but direct communication. But the vigorous life of our college days sweeps us away from them and we see them only intermittently. Then we enter the real world, and in our struggles, we forget entirely these gods, or at least we seem to forget them. In these years, again to quote Emerson, who seems almost to have been thinking of the graduating student:

He fancies himself in a vast crowd which sways this way and that and whose movement and doings he must obey. . . . The mad crowd drives hither and thither, now furiously commanding this thing to be done, now that. What is he that should resist their will, and think or act for himself? Every moment new changes and new showers of deceptions to baffle and distract him. . . . And when, by and by, for an instant, the air clears and the cloud lifts a little, there are the gods still sitting around him on their thrones—they alone with him alone.

In our own literature of the past we may find "the good and great for company."

## COLLEGE ADMISSION AND THE THIRD DIMENSION

LOUIS T. BENEZET

PRESIDENT, ALLEGHENY COLLEGE

OUR title bears the suspicion of double-talk. If so, it reflects its subject matter in, I think, a fairly accurate way. A good many of us in the college business are double-talking to the rest of the education-minded world. The literature on college admissions is rich with the air of exclusion. Current studies are arguing that proportionately not more, but fewer, students in the future should go to college:—more to be sure of the right kind and fewer of the wrong kind, but fewer or at least no more in the over-all proportion of tomorrow's population. College catalogue statements are echoing this at least faintly by detailing various obstacles to admission, and by insisting how lucky that student should consider himself who becomes admitted to College X, Y, or Z.

Yet at the same time colleges in most areas are invading available sources of student supply with squadrons of admissions salesmen. They are sending so-called counselors out to cajole, beg, bedazzle and sometimes bribe outright, high school seniors into making their way toward the respective colleges. There appears to be in this, borrowing a phrase from an earlier educational treatise, an ungainly hiatus between the practical boot top and the academic pants leg. Our spokesmen who write in research pamphlets are speaking about limiting college admission in order to return the student body to its former intellectual purity . . . though comparative evidence on student bodies of different periods is scanty in support of the assumption. At the same moment the henchmen from many administration buildings are out soliciting students for all they are worth, quantity being the main consideration. It is time perhaps that the two operations were brought together. Should we say what we are doing, or should we do what we are saying?

NOTE: Presented before a joint meeting of the Pennsylvania Association of the Deans of Women and Women's University Club of Philadelphia; Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 17, 1953.



May we first rule out of the discussion all elements of student admission as it affects the balancing of college budgets. Colleges are businesses, running on from thousands to many millions of dollars each year. When applicants are plentiful, admissions requirements rise. Some colleges during the postwar GI boom took advantage of this, for instance, to go back to traditional subject requirements which during the depression and war years they had prudently discarded. When applicants become more scarce, as they have during the past three years, requirements go down. Indeed there is room for suspicion that some colleges during the past year have pretty well scrapped requirements beyond the earning of a diploma in a recognized high school. These things are not educational but economic. Our mission here shall be to discuss college admission not from the standpoint of the college treasurer but from the standpoint of the prospective students.

Secondly, may we rule out revolutionary theories *à la Spencer* which might predict that no matter what happens, more and more people will go to college until we have 100% attendance of all young people between the approximate ages of 17 and 22. The idea of a college education for every young American, irrespective of size, type, purpose or brain belongs not with the educator but with the ad-man, along with the two chickens in the pot, the two cars in the garage, the pie in the sky by and by. College education is not something which must grow without limit, like the sales of television sets; it is a specific experience which ought to go to specific persons with specific purposes. The belief this paper will advance that we tend to talk as if it were too specific an arrangement, does not exclude the proposal that we rid ourselves of any notions that a college education is something that will or should become universal.

Third, may we take the course, theoretically at least, of ruling out factors of cost to the student. It will be impossible entirely to do this. But with a productive economy in America surpassing three hundred billion dollars a year, it would seem that we can accept Mr. Seymour Harris' dictum of four years ago, that this country is capable of keeping as many young people in college and off the labor market as it decides it wants to. Individual problems of finding means for individual students to be



sure remain, and will affect all our considerations of them.

The thesis here proposed is really not a thesis but a question: "How should college attendance be limited?" After we have discussed this we might reverse the question slightly and ask, not, "Who should go to college?" but "To whom should college go?". In proposing this minor heresy I shall press the point that *it is the business of our colleges to go to whoever ought to be in college*, not to remain passively to be courted by those who decide by one reason or another that they want to come.

The paradox referred to at the start of this paper is a historic one. Most colleges being marginal ventures, economically speaking, have been more or less hungry for students ever since they were founded. Yet because their courses were geared to only a certain kind of student they have also been exclusive to greater or less degree. Their exclusiveness dates to Greek times when higher education was the privilege of the freeman as distinguished from the slave. As colleges developed in America, however, the exclusiveness was characterized rather by the type of curriculum available at the time, and the mentality, background and purpose this curriculum subsumed. Allegheny College was founded in 1815 in a genuinely frontier Western Pennsylvania. Its first president, Timothy Alden, a Harvard scholar who had delivered his commencement oration in Syriac, planned the course at Allegheny to become a small Western Harvard. This required the ability to discourse in Latin and Greek, since college classes were conducted in those languages; it also assumed some mathematics. It can be imagined just how many of the sons of the pioneers were found so equipped. This dilemma eventually defeated Alden, and the college closed in 1831 "without students or prospects." Even the device of the academy to prepare students in the proper subjects, though it continued at Allegheny until 1910, provided no perfect solution to the perennial problem of recruiting students capable of absorbing a course of study based upon the specialities of the classical scholar.

In contrast, the modern college of liberal arts opens its doors to almost any mentally able product of a general high school course irrespective of subject matter background. In fact, many high school counselors and principals fail to recognize just how

free colleges have become in accepting high school subjects for admission. I was surprised recently, at a state-wide meeting of public school educators, to find that some remarks on this point were greeted as mildly sensational. The datum I reported was that out of 20 representative Pennsylvania colleges and universities examined, only seven were found to make any definite insistence about what particular high school subjects should be presented for entrance. A majority, to be sure, advised a certain pattern of the usual academic courses; but two thirds of the colleges indicated that these requirements may be waived for the student with sufficient general aptitude and a good grade average. Naturally we would pause at admitting a boy with nothing but shopwork and physical education, or a girl with nothing but home economics and applied music. In practice the student with such a narrowly vocational background is rare in admissions-application folders. Indeed he is probably rarer than he should be; for it might be well to recall that the Eight-Year Study of 30 secondary schools a decade ago established the point that the specific subject studied in high school has little to do with success in college. The college professor has a habit of treating the freshman anyway as if everything he learned in high school was worthless; hence why should we pretend that the pattern of his subjects makes him a better or a poorer college prospect? What we are after is general intelligence, sensitivity to what is new, and above all, a will to learn. About these more can be said.

Meanwhile, it seems evident that college admission today need not be seriously limited by the type of high school preparation the student presents. The specific gaps can soon be made up at the college level. And if we should deny consideration to the occasional commercial or home economics student of high rank who suddenly wants to go to college, then we indeed may be putting up anti-democratic barriers. It is my observation once again that the colleges are ahead of the high schools in this manner; and that some high school counselors are discouraging good prospects from applying to college, simply because they have not had the right-sounding respectable courses in their high school curriculums.

The high school course of study, academic or non-academic, or "college versus commercial," is much less apt to be an indication of college potentiality than it is an indication of social status. The question of social status is the second item for our consideration of how college attendance is, or might be, limited. The selection of high school programs according to caste and class is a pesky problem as all high school administrators and teachers can testify. I can well remember the utter misfortune of having had two buildings in my own high school, one of which was devoted to the college preparation course, the other to the so-called practical arts. The caste feeling that resulted between "old building kids" and "new building kids" was a sad and early lesson in sociology to the youngsters of that city. Likewise, in a city recently I was told that attempts to prepare secretaries through means of a high school commercial course were failing because all the bright, attractive girls considered it a social stigma to take the commercial course; they took the college course as the thing to do, whether or not they were intending to go to college.

Social status as a determinant of who should go to college has been called by competent recent observers the most important index of them all. As Warner, Havighurst and Loeb developed in the 1944 study, *Who Shall Be Educated?*, and as Hollinshead recapitulates in the current study, *Who Should Go To College?*, social status may be actually more important than economic status in directing high school graduates either toward or away from college. Case after case reports that a given boy or girl of sparkling promise did not go to college mainly because he or she came from a family and a neighborhood from which people just didn't go to college. And the cases are almost as plentiful for the mediocre or even dull youngster who is pushed into some college because college is what is supposed to happen to people of his age in his particular well-upholstered set.

The problem of the extent to which this social stratification in America can or should be opposed in order to get the right people in college is better ground for a sociologist than for a college administrator. The authors of *Who Shall Be Educated?* even propose that any violent departure from the system, such as would be subsumed by the President's Commission on Higher

Education, in its calling for 4,600,000 college students by 1960, would actually throw things into chaos, socially speaking, and thus should be avoided. A caste system is apparently preferable in some minds to social uncertainty and disorder; there is a great human yearning to "know one's place."

The truth of all this, as I say, may be beyond the ken of a layman in these matters; however even a layman might well underscore the sociologist's admission of a good deal of what he calls "social mobility": the principle which does permit youngsters to rise through the caste strata. I can remember at Dartmouth 20 years ago talking with a college friend, an immigrant mill worker's son, who had just come back from spending his Easter vacation with a fraternity brother who lived on an estate on Long Island. Be not misled into thinking that getting up with the Joneses is the motive here. It is the more complete use of our prime natural resource—the dedication and potential power of our young people—which ought to be the goal of every man and woman engaged in the business of education. If a youngster from a street where nobody goes to college can be changed into a youngster who does go to college, merely through the persistence of some teacher who will not let him rest until he does go, then we are accomplishing something, no matter how one may wish to carve up the social system of our country on the sociologists' charts.

A third type of college limitation was argued by strong inference recently by the economist, Seymour Harris, in his book, *The Market for College Graduates*. Mr. Harris is a man of formidable documentation. His 1949 study rather devastatingly showed that if higher education is still aiming at the magistracy, then we are rapidly—or at least were rapidly then—running out of posts for magistrates. More specifically, Harris showed that our society and economy could not in future years find college-level occupations for more than a fraction of the people being turned out annually with college degrees. He showed that this would be so even if certain restricted professions, such as medicine, should be opened so that supply might more adequately meet demand. Mr. Harris predicted that college graduates in a few years would have to be content with selling and clerking positions or even manual labor; and perhaps woman had better

decide after all that her place is in the home. The author concluded that the solution must lie not only in a continual assault on artificially restricted professions but on the "non-economic gains of education"—in other words, on education for its own sake rather than for a high-level prestige position among wage earners.

Once again it would be the better part of valor not to tangle with a professional in his chosen field. Time alone has the habit of upsetting a number of economists' theories. When Mr. Harris' book was written, the curiously beneficial tragedy of Korea (beneficial, economically speaking, that is) was not dreamed of. In three years the professional picture has reversed itself. Already the engineering profession is telling us we are producing yearly less than half the 40,000 trained engineers it needs; and other professions are taking their cues from this.

It begins to look as if the Harris thesis, like others of its kind, failed to take into account the simple prodigious power of our economy to expand itself. There is very little suggestion today that we are educating too many people in college. I know of no historical precedent for thinking that the products of education will long go unused in the market place. That we can become too highly educated a people, for all the economist's figures, is to me as unlikely a prediction as that the sun will rise in the west tomorrow.

By far, the most authoritative attack upon the problem of college admission appears in the current Staff Study for the Commission on Financing Higher Education, entitled, *Who Should Go To College?*, by Byron S. Hollinshead. Mr. Hollinshead, as he did when he was president of Coe College, takes exception to the plea of the President's Commission on Higher Education for some kind of college training for one half the nation's youth. By careful analysis presented with a frank Jeffersonian bias, similar to the Harvard Report on General Education, the author shows why one can believe that only the upper fourth or less of our population are fit to benefit from formal education past high school (not counting trade education). Part of this he bases on records of high school performance; part on the fact that a large proportion of our population



simply do not care about such things as higher education and are apparently not worth prodding; and very largely out of a faith in the validity of tests of intelligence and aptitude. Mr. Hollinshead shows strong belief in the predictive value of tests of mental ability. He presents evidence to show the practical unlikelihood of a student's completing an accredited college course if he has an IQ of less than 110, or even 115.

The study, *Who Should Go To College?*, does indeed lay greatest emphasis upon the need to identify the real talent among our top-quarter young people and to assist more of those by various means to go to college. Few of us, moreover, would argue that most students below the top half of their high school class will and do have difficulty in getting through a college of quality. What I find questionable in Hollinshead's thesis is its reliance upon measurements of intellect as defined by a paper test or a high school average. One is impressed by such counter-statements based on findings as that by E. S. Jones in "Why Students Fail in College"<sup>1</sup> in which he says: "no measuring instruments, whether aptitude tests or college grades, are accurate or final indicators of potential capacity to benefit by college training." It is dangerous to condemn students to permanent mental categories. For one thing the categories often fail to agree with each other. Hollinshead varies between using the upper half of the high school class and a grade of 110 or above, in the IQ test as his criterion for college eligibility. Yet we know that these two do not always intercorrelate well. The tendency to categorize students as being destined for this or that degree of educability can lead us into a pursuit of the obviously elite and a neglect of many others who might be sparked into performance.

This leads me to my counter-thesis, something I have observed in fifteen years of work with college admission and its results. My counter-thesis is that the paper and pencil test of ability and the high school standing are neither one as good a predictor of a college prospect as is the personal analysis of some good high school counselor who knows the boy or girl and his background. This is the Third Dimension in college admission. For it no tables or charts exist. But is it not the kernel of our job: to know our people as individuals; to delve into their personal

<sup>1</sup> Association of American Colleges *Bulletin*, May 1953.



stories, and their personal promise; to tackle their difficulties and obstacles with them? If the result of this high-school digging looks promising, it is such students to whom college should go. We should not wait for them to come to us. All the tests we have, of mental ability, high school achievement, interest patterns, emotional stability and so on, are less helpful than would be one real test of motivation. Lacking that test, the high school teacher and the college counselor must be willing to make the judgment. There are far too many students who have made a liar out of some statistic that they could not possibly succeed in college for us to accept, for instance, the IQ test as the bell that summons us to heaven or to hell. It is perfectly true that a boy or girl with IQ score registering 105 or even 110 may have travail and sorrow in getting through college. But the boy or girl will always come who will do it and if he will do it he should be helped. For one thing, the proper choice of college may have as much to do with success as a 5 or 10 IQ point margin. It was Harry Emerson Fosdick who said, "Democracy is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people."

The theories of how much brains it takes to get through college rest upon those abilities to conceptualize and think abstractly which we associate with college education. Certainly not all can do these tasks. Perhaps we are arguing only on the basis of the ten IQ points between 100 and 110, if indeed these can be accepted as reliable. I represent a college which in practice has followed Hollinshead's advice; yet there have been startling exceptions. I do know that we have not exhausted our potentialities for teaching students of widely differing abilities. We have not learned all there is to be learned about making learning real to people of these various potentials. We are far from knowing all we can know about what audio-visual aids, for instance, can do to spark minds of more modest ability. Recent films are making headway even into topics of logic and critical thinking.

All the foregoing arguments rest, furthermore, upon the assumption that higher education will stay fairly constant in content and scope. There is little precedent for such assumption. Whatever our beliefs may be about what and how many students should go to college, one thing is stronger than all the studies made by educators, economists, sociologists and what-have-you.

That is the fact that society will demand and get the education it wants for its young people. It is all very well for us in the colleges to decide to what proportion of our young people we should grant admission. Society goes right on in each generation sending a greater and greater proportion of its people to college; and the colleges in each generation somehow have found ways of making the time of those constantly greater numbers of young people reasonably worth while.

Perhaps our job is not to spend so much time deciding whether more or less belong in college—some, I am sure, do not—but to decide rather which of them who should come are still not getting their chance. In this, all studies herein quoted agree. We can spend our time if we want mourning because so many lazy, superficial and stupid people are being let into college. (As a college administrator I would grant it a favor if the high schools could pre-screen out a few more of such for us.) But I am more concerned about the people we do not get who should come. I believe this should have the main emphasis in our individual and collective admissions work. Not all these young people will be of the highest mentality—though many, we know, are,—but each of them may have a potential drive toward successful service which the country can ill afford to lose. There are still too many girls for instance who are not going to college simply because their parents see no purpose in college education for women. We should be visiting such families; we should be showing them the statistics of 21,000,000 women working today, a third of the nation's working force, and 60% of these married; and we should be pointing out that it is in the parents' interest for their daughters to prepare for as high a level of occupation as they can. This is a world of mobility and change. Change requires the ability to meet change; and this in turn is one of the definitions of education.

*To conclude:* There are several young people in your community and mine who should not come to college but who are now coming and will continue to come. But there are many young people in your community and mine to whom college should go and to whom it is not now going. It should go not with its hat or its checkbook in hand, but with a straight proposition of what college can mean. The college should look at

these young people not merely through the fine screens of subject-matter preparation, or social status, or market outlets, or even the IQ records. The college instead should see each one as an individual with perhaps a small shining world of his own to gain, if someone like us will only appear with the right encouragement at the right time.

The late Marshal Foch of France is said to have held his leadership over the Allied Forces in World War I by an ability to ask at the right moment the question, "*De quoi s'agit-il?*"—"What is the problem?" Now that we have discussed the topic of who should go to college, and to whom college should go, I am not content that we have spent our time on the real question facing colleges today. In our debate about whether or not motivation is more important than IQ which is found to be 109 and not 110, I suspect we have been, to quote a more recent general, fighting the wrong war at the wrong place and the wrong time. The war we do need to fight and win is not this. It is the war of what college is really for and hence what the college should teach.

Our real battle in the colleges is against over-specialism and for the teaching of human understanding, upon which all use of knowledge, except perhaps military knowledge, ultimately depends. It is against the crazy rush toward more job-line-specification courses and majors, insofar as these throttle the curriculum and give it no free air to breathe. There is no need to defend, on the other hand, the dilettante liberal arts major sequence which gives the student nothing he can profitably use. But what is happening today is a growth far beyond the reasonable limits of a useful major—a major, say, which might occupy one fourth of the student's undergraduate time. We are seeing instead majors and associated requirements which literally squeeze out the time the student should be spending in the areas of general thought. The blame for this can be laid at the door of modern business, with its hurry-up demands for some new kind of specially-tooled human wrench, to fit over a particular bolt it happens to need being twisted at a certain time. Modern government, modern social welfare services and indeed modern education are falling in with the specialist trend. The craze toward specialism is flatly contradictory to the advice of the

really top men of business, who chorus their conviction that, "The real problems in business are not technical problems, but human problems." As the April 1953 issue of *Fortune* states, "U. S. business is talking a great deal these days about its need for more broadly educated men . . . men who have acquired the range of interests and the mental disciplines that education in the liberal arts or humanities (sic) is peculiarly well fitted to give." Yet, the article goes on to observe, "The specialization is shocking; we're all obsessed with expertise"; and it notes, "Results (of a college survey) show that students are taking and colleges are giving less fundamental education than ever before . . . the fact is that business itself is largely to blame."

I present this last bit not as a new theme, but as a sort of coda in a minor key. The situation may not be entirely discouraging. General education after all is still a lively thing in many colleges. But the breath of the specialists is ever upon us.

This discussion has urged that the college should go to students who have the promise to make something of themselves. But let us go to them with a picture of real dimensions. Shall we not describe for these prospective students the truly broad horizon of higher learning: a horizon not merely filled with the trappings of technology, but rather a horizon bright with the wonder and promise of the best in mankind? If we present this picture, my guess is that the ones we really want, will respond.

## FINE ARTS IN A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

JOHN O. GROSS

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS,  
METHODIST CHURCH

I HAVE been trying to discover the reason for the invitation to give the dedication address for the Loar Fine Arts Building. Likely, it was not because of my being from Nashville, for Nashville's fame is never identified in the strictest sense with Fine Arts. The city is widely known as the Capital of Hillbilly Music. It should be said that while hillbilly music has prospered in Nashville, the city can boast of being an important art center in the South. Here is a replica of the Parthenon, and a State Capitol which is considered one of the finest exhibits of Greek architecture found in the United States. The lovely homes of Nashville also reflect an interest in the beautiful.

I would like to think the invitation came because of a desire to see West Virginia Wesleyan become a great cultural center. This institution, I have said, ought to send into the life of West Virginia an attitude that would awaken a concern for beautiful and lovely things. There is needed in contemporary life an influence to counteract the ones which tend to lower the taste for the best in art and music. We are constantly surrounded with the mediocre in music. This morning when I tried to get some news over the radio station, I tuned into a man with a guitar. Daily the radio stations of the nation broadcast programs which do not elevate or lift.

Some months ago when radio station WSM discontinued its FM band with a continuous broadcast of classical music, I protested. I contended that there was needed in Nashville an influence to offset its extensive broadcasting of so-called folk music. West Virginia Wesleyan College ought to constantly exalt the lovely and the beautiful and thus lift the tastes of people for music above many of the common things that are frequently heard over the radio. Exhibits of art and excellent music can counteract the inelegant and coarse.

NOTE: An address delivered March 13, 1953 at the dedication of the L. L. Loar Memorial Building of Music and Fine Arts, West Virginia Wesleyan College.



America has not reached a high level of appreciation for the best in art and music. In fact, there are times when the unappreciative attitude taken by Americans toward art greatly embarrasses. Some of our cities boast of their excellent symphony orchestras, yet the basis for support from the patrons is the orchestra's value as a good advertising medium for the city. Last summer while in England, I heard of some American tourists who visited the British Museum. An observer who watched them enter and saw them emerge twenty minutes later sarcastically asked, "I wonder what detained them so long?"

We need to appreciate the beauty that is around us here in these hills. When I was a district superintendent in the mountains of eastern Kentucky, I often wished that I might have the soul of a poet and the eye of an artist in order to really enjoy the scenery in that wonderful country.

Here are a few ways a fine arts program will enable the institution to enrich its educational work.

First, it makes for the appreciation of the beautiful and lovely. This can be done by helping students to know something of the development of art through the ages. The history of the race is not just a prosaic account written in a book. It also has been written in great art productions, in inspiring music, in fine sculpture. Those of us who live in this generation should be reminded of the contributions made by men in other days. When we look backward we see that some men have lived who probably had more artistic skill, greater spiritual insight and a deeper appreciation for the beautiful than any who live in this day. It is, therefore, important that every student who goes through college shall be exposed to the best in art and music.

An institution is fortunate to have on its staff a few great musicians and artists. Baldwin-Wallace College was enriched by the presence of Dean Albert Reimenschneider, a great interpreter of Bach. Baldwin-Wallace students exposed to his annual concerts doubtless carried with them a lifelong concern for good music. An educational institution, if it fulfills its responsibility in Fine Arts, will help create in the life of its students an appreciation for the best in music.

Second, an educational program should carry with it the opportunities the fine arts offer for discipline. No area of educa-



tion gives to students discipline more than the arts. Particularly is this true of music. Sometimes I question our trying to measure an educational program in music in terms of credit hours. After all, knowledge and skill in music is not secured by merely completing a certain number of hours. To achieve in music requires the giving of one's self to long periods of practice and in sacrificial devotion to a great objective. Persons who have made music a life interest have been willing to discipline themselves, to go, as it were, through the "straight gate." Achievement in music and in art requires discipline of the most exacting sort.

A college, such as this, should have in its instructional program of fine arts, teachers able to inspire discipline. The faculty should be a performing one, able to exemplify the actualities of good music and art. It is known that many persons who decide to specialize in arts and music frequently are inspired to make the decision through observing excellent performances.

Concomitant with achievement in the arts, the discipline brings both perseverance and ultimate character. Fine arts within the program of an educational institution furnishes many needed aids to students in their character growth.

Third, there are spiritual concepts associated with the fine arts equal, if not superior, to any found in the educational program. Great music is associated with the spirit. You do not think of Handel's achievement apart from his spiritual experiences. Handel prayed each day that the work he had written might become acceptable to God and influential among the people. A superintendent of city schools in a state that had a negative attitude toward the teaching of religion could not through the routine educational program include anything that emphasized religion. He found out, however, that there was no law against sacred music. Great spiritual oratorios produced by great masters were accepted without protest.

It is in the area of religion that we achieve real ecumenicity, for there we find that music has its own language that speaks to people of all races and lands. It is not one of dogma, but of the spirit and through the spirit it touches many lives.

Art brings inspiration for the development of our own religious life in another way. It excites a sense of creatorship. We become co-partners with God in some great creative activity. No

one can have this consciousness without having an awareness of being associated with the Creator Himself.

Doubtless, this institution will want to make this part of its program an outlet for professional development. Young people should have the chance to specialize in music and art, just as they do in business administration, in chemistry, in engineering and in teacher training.

This program of fine arts should also emphasize art as a leisure-time avocation. In this day of a 35 or 40-hour work week colleges should assume some responsibility in helping students to use constructively their leisure time. No more productive use could be made of leisure hours than through cultivation of the arts.

Several years ago there was placed in my hands a little booklet written by a former president of this institution, Dr. Wallace B. Fleming. In it he dealt with the vocational emphasis of the Epworth League work of the Methodist Church and showed the effect of an avocation upon life. He held that the avocation had greater influence upon a person's character than his vocation. In this connection he used this illustration: Two men worked side by side in a shop as cabinet makers. One was interested in race horses. He knew their names, the location of the tracks and where to place his bets. In spare time he read racing news and studied race results. His partner was a member of a church choir and interested in sacred music. At his work he whistled anthems and hymns. His concern constantly centered about the development of his church choir. I need not mention which avocation had the most profound influence upon character.

This use of leisure is not limited to music or to painting or sculpture. Many men with an appreciation of the beautiful have set up workshops and have demonstrated skill in the making of nice furniture. Young women who become homemakers should know what is proper in the way of color schemes, in order to take any kind of house, large or small, and make it beautiful and attractive.

Most of the things that I have said would fit into the educational program of any institution of higher learning. Here let

me point out some specific things that ought to characterize a Department of Fine Arts in a Christian college.

We live in a time when art is emphasized for art's sake. It no longer is art for Christ's sake. This may account for our being exposed to many ugly demonstrations of painting. Hugh S. Tigner has referred in his "Our Prodigal Son Culture" to the book *I Would Be A Private*. In it John Stowe, the artist, placed his easel in a place known for its beauty. Looking out there across the bay, he sees the sails of ships, the sun, and his location is just right where a man can get the coloring needed for a wonderful picture. He looks and then he begins to paint. When completed there is no sun, no beautiful colors, no ships on the canvas, but something resembling a whole pile of skulls. Growing out of the skulls are unattractive weeds and vegetation. Under the picture is the caption, "Woman and Putrified Owl." Then the writer added, "John Stowe looked, and then he put down on the canvas what he felt inside."

Art, in order that it might lift to the highest level, should express the spiritual. Here is needed an emphasis that art is something that can be conceived for Christ's sake. You cannot go through a gallery containing great paintings from the masters without noting that they had a concern for the glory of God. This gave them great subjects and drew real inspiration. They did not allow personal and selfish selections to come first, but sought ways of glorifying God and lifting up the beauty associated with His name. The great cathedrals of Europe and the great art galleries always remind us of the inspiration furnished in art for Christ's sake which produces works that live through the years.

I hope that this institution, as it plans its program in arts, will be able to help youth find opportunities for service in the church. Young people trained in the arts are needed for the church's educational program. Visual education more and more is assuming a larger place in the church's educational program.

Music should play a significant role in the Christian college. Methodism has a great heritage at this point. Music was a passion of the Wesley family. In the story of the development of music in this country it is said that Charles Wesley and Isaac Watt made large contributions to music appreciation through

their hymns. It was they who gave frontiersmen whatever lofty outlook they possessed in music. This is the opinion of students who have made very careful analyses of the contribution of the English thought to the building of American culture. Dr. Betts, one of Wesley's biographers, mentions the influence of the hymnbook upon the lowly and underprivileged people of England. Placing a hymnbook in their hands, Dr. Betts said, brought to them their first appreciation of good literature and of good music. Many later rose from where they had no appreciation of fine things to become patrons of the arts.

John Wesley published a hymnbook containing his and his brother Charles' hymns. In its introduction he calls attention to the fact that many people have taken his and his brother's hymns and reprinted them without permission. He writes: "Now they are perfectly welcome so to do provided they print them as they are. . . . I must beg of them one of these two favors, either let them stand just as they are or to add the true reading in the margin that we may no longer be accountable either for the nonsense or for the doggerel of other men." John Wesley carried with him a profound respect for exact and beautiful expression and the Methodist Church and its institutions have a great heritage in this connection.

Music appreciation and religion can travel together. It is out of the soul of the man who has profound religious experience that we get the finest in musical expression. Mrs. Goodrich C. White of Atlanta, wife of the president of Emory University, has written a book entitled *With Wings As Eagles*, dealing with the experience through which she passed after her son was lost in World War II. This crisis found her unprepared for the news of his death and she was forced to go back and reconstruct her own thinking in order to accept the inevitable. Her son was a promising young musician and the sense of loss was increased because he had such a bright future before him in music. But as she studied him, his letters, and recalled many of the things he had said, she saw that this understanding that he had in music was not something that came alone from his talent. It was the reflection of a deep spiritual perception. Looking back over their associations, she discerned how the spiritual outlook on life affects a person's skill and performance in music.

Growth in the appreciation of art depends not merely upon the training of the hands and the eyes, but also upon the cultivation of the spirit. Development of the spiritual life should bring enrichment to all of life. Because of this, spiritually minded people can see beauty not discerned without spiritual enrichment.

Life itself demands a spiritual interpretation. It calls upon this institution to relieve the barrenness of these days with the best in art, both from past and present. What would life be to many persons without the strength derived from the Psalms or the 14th chapter of John, or choice selections of great literature? What would life mean to many without the enrichment that comes through music? These blessings we do not inherit. They have to be acquired and cultivated to be passed on. This institution now, through this splendid plant and excellent equipment, may be able to render a much larger and more constructive ministry through the arts.

The trustees of West Virginia Wesleyan shall always have a deep sense of gratitude because Mrs. L. L. Loar made this building possible. In the future it should be possible to say that this gift stands as one of the most significant made, not only to West Virginia Wesleyan, but to the state itself. From here an influence should emanate to lift the cultural life of the state and nation. Sacrifices made to produce this building will be entirely recompensed if through the finest that is in art and music young men and young women leave this institution to go out into life discontented with unworthy expressions of art and work to make the finest associated with our great heritage appreciated and revered. So, Mr. President, this day opens the way for West Virginia Wesleyan to assume a larger responsibility as a cultural center with wider chances to lift the taste of the territory it serves in art.



## THE LIBERAL ARTS IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN SOCIETY

GEORGE F. KENNAN

FORMER AMBASSADOR TO RUSSIA

THE sense of warmth and reassurance that flows from this occasion means all the more to me because I cannot forget that there are forces at large in our society today that do not inspire me with this same feeling—quite the contrary. These forces are too diffuse to be described by their association with the name of any one man or any one political concept.

They have no distinct organizational forms. They are as yet largely matters of the mind and the emotion in large masses of individuals. But they all march, in one way or another, under the banner of an alarmed and exercised anti-communism—but an anti-communism of a quite special variety, bearing an air of excited discovery and proprietorship, as though no one had ever known before that there was a Communist danger; as though no one had ever thought about it and taken its measure; as though it had begun about the year 1945 and these people were the first to learn of it.

I have no quarrel to pick with the ostensible purpose of the people in whom these forces are manifest. Surely, many of them are sincere. Surely, many of them are good people. Surely, many of them have come to these views under real provocation and out of real bewilderment. But I have the deepest misgivings about the direction and effects of their efforts.

In general, I feel that what they are doing is unwise and unfortunate, and I am against it. They distort and exaggerate the dimensions of the problem with which they profess to deal. They confuse internal and external aspects of the Communist threat. They insist on portraying as contemporary realities things that had their actuality years ago. They insist on ascribing to the workings of domestic communism evils and frustrations which, in so far as they were not part of the normal and un-

NOTE: From an address at the dedication of the new L. A. O'Shaughnessy Hall of Liberal and Fine Arts, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana, May 15, 1953, published in *The Washington Post*, May 17, 1953.



avoidable burden of complexity in our life, were the product of our behavior generally as a Nation, and should today be the subject of humble and contrite soul-searching on the part of all of us, in a spirit of brotherhood and community, rather than of frantic and bitter recrimination.

And having thus incorrectly stated the problem, it is no wonder that these people constantly find the wrong answers. They tell us to remove our eyes from the constructive and positive purposes and to pursue with fanaticism the negative and vindictive ones. They sow timidity where there should be boldness; fear where there should be serenity; suspicion where there should be confidence and generosity. In this way they impel us—in the name of our salvation from the dangers of communism—to many of the habits of thought and action which our Soviet adversaries, I am sure, would most like to see us adopt and which they have tried unsuccessfully over a period of some 35 years to graft upon us through the operations of their Communist Party.

I would not mention these things if I felt that they were only my personal concern and had no relation to the undertaking which we have gathered today to celebrate. But I fear that there is here a serious relevance which we cannot ignore.

Thanks to the vision of wise and generous people, this university is now adding one more important unit to the number of those facilities in our country in which men can cultivate their own understanding, and extend the boundaries of knowledge in the field of arts and letters. Certainly there could be no finer undertaking and none more needed. But I feel that this undertaking, too, will have to deal at some point with the forces I have just described—that by entering upon this undertaking you will eventually find that these forces will be your concern just as they have already become the concern of some of us who have walked in other branches of life.

I feel this first of all because these forces are narrowly exclusive in their approach to our world position and carry this exclusiveness vigorously into the field of international cultural exchanges. They tend to stifle the interchange of cultural impulses that is vital to the progress of the intellectual and artistic life of our people. The people in question seem to feel either that cultural values are not important at all or that America has reached

the apex of cultural achievement and no longer needs in any serious way the stimulus of normal contact with other peoples in the field of arts and letters.

They look with suspicion both on the sources of intellectual and artistic activity in this country and on impulses of this nature coming to us from abroad. The remote pasts of foreign artists and scholars are anxiously scanned before they are permitted to enter our land, and this is done in proceedings so inflexible in concept and offensive in execution that their very existence often constitutes a discouragement to cultural interchange. The personal movements and affairs of great scholars and artists are thus passed upon and controlled by people who have no inkling of understanding for the creative work these same scholars and artists perform.

In this way, we begin to draw about ourselves a cultural curtain similar in some respects to the Iron Curtain of our adversaries. In doing so, we tend to inflict upon ourselves a species of cultural isolation and provincialism wholly out of accord with the traditions of our Nation and destined, if unchecked, to bring to our intellectual and artistic life the same sort of sterility from which the cultural world of our Communist adversaries is already suffering.

A second reason why I think you will have to concern yourselves with the forces to which I have pointed is that within the framework of our society, as in its relations to external environment, the tendency of these forces is exclusive and intolerant—quick to reject, slow to receive, intent on discovering what ought *not* to be rather than what *ought* to be.

They claim the right to define a certain area of our national life and cultural output as beyond the bounds of righteous approval. This definition is never effected by law or by constituted authority; it is effected by vague insinuation and suggestion. And the circle, as I say, tends to grow constantly narrower.

One has the impression that, if uncountered, these people would eventually narrow the area of political and cultural respectability to a point where it included only themselves, the excited accusers, and excluded everything and everybody not embraced in the profession of denunciation.

I recall reading recently, twice in one day, the words of individuals who proclaimed that if certain other people did not get up and join actively in the denunciation of Communists or communism, they would thereby themselves be suspect. What sort of arrogance is this? Every one of us has his civic obligations. Every one of us has his moral obligations to the principles of loyalty and decency.

I am not condoning anyone for forgetting these obligations. But to go beyond this—to say that it is not enough to be a law-abiding citizen—to say that we all have some obligation to get up and make statements of this tenor or that with respect to other individuals, or else submit to being classified as suspect in the eyes of our fellow citizens—to assert this is to establish a new species of public ritual, to arrogate to one's individual self the powers of the spiritual and temporal lawgiver, to make the definition of social conduct a matter of fear in the face of vague and irregular forces, rather than a matter of confidence in the protecting discipline of conscience and the law.

I would know of no moral or political authority for this sort of thing. I tremble when I see this attempt to make a semireligious cult out of emotional-political currents of the moment, and particularly when I note that these currents are ones exclusively negative in nature, designed to appeal only to men's capacity for hatred and fear, never to their capacity for forgiveness and charity and understanding.

I have lived more than 10 years of my life in totalitarian countries. I know where this sort of thing leads. I know it to be the most shocking and cynical disservice one can do to the credulity and to the spiritual equilibrium of one's fellowmen.

And this sort of thing cannot fail to have its effect on the liberal arts, for it is associated with two things that stand in deepest conflict to the development of mind and spirit: with a crass materialism and anti-intellectualism on the one hand, and with a marked tendency toward a standardization and conformity on the other.

In these forces I have spoken about, it seems to me that I detect a conscious rejection and ridicule of intellectual effort and distinction. They come together here with a deep-seated weakness

in the American character: a certain shy self-consciousness that tends to deny interests other than those of business, sport or war.

There is a powerful strain of our American cast of mind that has little use for the artist or the writer, and professes to see in the pursuits of such people a lack of virility—as though virility could not find expression in the creation of beauty, as though Michaelangelo had never wielded his brush, as though Dante had never taken up his pen, as though the plays of Shakespeare were lacking in manliness.

The bearers of this neo-materialism seem, indeed, to have a strange self-consciousness about the subject of virility—a strange need to emphasize and demonstrate it by exhibitions of taciturnity, callousness and physical aggressiveness—as though there were some anxiety lest, in the absence of these exhibitions, it might be found wanting.

What weakness is it in us Americans that so often makes us embarrassed or afraid to indulge the gentle impulse, to seek the finer and rarer flavor, to admit frankly and without stammering apologies to an appreciation for the wonder of the poet's word and the miracle of the artist's brush, for all the beauty, in short, that has been recorded in the images of word and line created by the hands of men in past ages? What is it that makes us fear to acknowledge the greatness of other lands, or of other times, to shun the subtle and the unfamiliar?

What is it that causes us to huddle together, herdlike, in tastes and enthusiasms that represent only the common denominator of popular acquiescence, rather than to show ourselves receptive to the tremendous flights of creative imagination of which the individual mind has shown itself capable? Is it that we are forgetful of the true sources of our moral strength, afraid of ourselves, afraid to look into the chaos of our own breasts, afraid of the bright, penetrating light of the great teachers?

This fear of the untypical, this quest for security within the walls of secular uniformity—these are traits of our national character we would do well to beware of and to examine for their origins. They receive much encouragement these days, much automatic and unintended encouragement, by virtue of the growing standardization of the cultural and, in many respects, the educational influences to which our people are being subjected.

The immense impact of commercial advertising and the mass media on our lives is—let us make no mistake about it—an impact that tends to encourage passivity, to encourage acquiescence and uniformity, to place handicaps on individual contemplativeness and creativeness.

It may not seem to many of us too dangerous that we should all live, dress, eat, hear, and read substantially alike. But we forget how easily this uniformity of thought and habit can be exploited, when the will to exploit it is there. We forget how easily it can slip over into the domination of our spiritual and political lives by self-appointed custodians who contrive to set themselves at the head of popular emotional currents.

There is a real and urgent danger here for anyone who values the right to differ from others in any manner whatsoever, be it in his interests or his associations or his faith. There is no greater mistake we of this generation can make than to imagine that the tendencies which in other countries have led to the nightmare of totalitarianism will, as they appear in our own midst, politely pause—out of some delicate respect for American tradition—at the point where they would begin to affect our independence of mind and belief.

The forces of intolerance and political demagoguery are greedy forces, and unrestrained. There is no limit to their ambitions or their impudence. They contain within themselves no mechanism of self-control. Like the ills of Pandora's box, once released, they can be stopped only by forces external to themselves.

It is for these reasons that I feel that you, in setting up at this time within this great academic community a center for liberal arts, are taking upon yourselves a great, though honorable, burden. You are going to have to swim against the tide of many of the things I have been talking about.

You are frequently going to find arrayed against you, whether by intent or otherwise, the materialist, the anti-intellectuals, the chauvinists of all sizes and descriptions, the protagonists of violence and suspicion and intolerance, the people who take it upon themselves to delimit the operation of the principle of Christian charity, the people from whose memories there has passed the recollection that in their Father's house there are many mansions.



What you do in these walls will often be unsettling and displeasing to such people. They will view it with jealousy. You will have to bear their malice and their misrepresentation. But, unlike what many of them profess to wish to do to their own chosen enemies, it will be your task not to destroy them but to help in their redemption and remaking, to open their eyes, to demonstrate to them the sterility and hopelessness of negative undertakings, to engender in them an awareness of the real glories and the real horizons of the human spirit.

In this lies both the duty and the opportunity of the devotees of the liberal arts within our contemporary American civilization. It lies with them to combat the standardization of our day: to teach people to accept the great richness of the human mind and fantasy—to welcome it and to rejoice in it, happy that we have not been condemned by nature to a joyless monotony of the creative faculty, happy that there are so many marvelous ways in which the longings and dreams of men can find expression.

It lies with the devotees of the liberal arts to combat the materialism of our time: to teach us how to ride to work in a motor vehicle and absorb the canned music of the advertisers without forgetting that there is also a music of the spheres, to force us to remember that all the manifestations of our material prowess, impressive as they seem, are nevertheless only impermanent auxiliaries to our existence:

That the only permanent thing behind them all is still the naked vulnerable, human soul, the scene of the age-old battle between good and evil, assailed with weakness and imperfections, always in need of help and support, and yet sometimes capable of such breath-taking impulses of faith and creative imagination.

Finally, it lies with the devotees of the liberal arts to combat the forces of intolerance in our society: to convince people that these forces are incompatible with the flowering of the human spirit, to remember that the ultimate judgments of good and evil are not ours to make: that the wrath of man against his fellow man must always be tempered by the recollection of his weakness and fallibility and by the example of forgiveness and redemption which is the essence of his Christian heritage.

In *The Atlantic Monthly* of May 1953 in an article called "Training for Statesmanship" Mr. Kennan said,



"It is my impression, from the recollection of my days as an undergraduate, that understanding based on a firm grasp of the humanities, and character based on an uncompromising integrity in all personal associations, are the very essence of a liberal education and represent goals to which our colleges have clung in the face of very considerable pressures. This is my plea: Let those students who want to prepare themselves for work in the international field read their Bible and their Shakespeare, their Plutarch and their Gibbon, perhaps even their Latin and their Greek, and let them guard as the most precious of their possessions that concept of personal conduct which has grown up around the honor system, but of which the honor system is only a part and a symbol. Let them guard that code of behavior which means that men learn to act toward each other with honor and truthfulness and loyalty, to bestow confidence where confidence is asked, and to build within themselves those qualities of self-discipline and self-restraint on which the integrity of a public service must be founded."

## ATTITUDES OF SOCIOLOGISTS TOWARD GENERAL EDUCATION

LEO A. HAAK

PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

SECURING the active support of faculty members in the various specialized areas is one of the problems in developing a program of general education. This article is concerned with but one specialized field, sociology, and with the single question—What are the attitudes toward general education of chairmen of departments of sociology in selected colleges and universities? These findings should be of interest because the attitudes of sociologists are probably typical of those found among members of specialized groups.

Most sociologists believe that knowledge of sociology is essential for individual and group well-being, and that it should be a part of every college student's education. In fact, some seem convinced that it is essential for survival—as essential as vitamins and vaccination. They press for more sociology in college curricula and react to general education in terms of how they believe it will affect the future of sociology. Seeing in general education a threat to sociology, some have opposed it; others, seeing general education as a new frontier for the expansion of sociology, have favored it.

### *The Survey*

In order to collect data for use in the section on "Sociology and General Education" of the forty-sixth annual meeting of the American Sociological Society in 1951, a brief questionnaire was mailed to about one half of those listed as chairmen of departments of sociology in the 1950 *Directory of Members of the American Sociological Society*. Technically, a random sample was not used, but a conscious effort was made to diversify by size of institution, type and geographical area.

The questionnaires were mailed early in July and replies were requested by July 25. One might anticipate that few replies would be received at this unfavorable time of the year. However, 95 out of the 126 (75%) replied even though no follow-up

was used. It may be that so many responded because of the interest in the topic, and because they were invited to give their opinions.

### *A Classification of Sociologists by Attitudes*

The experimental approach was used in classifying the attitudes. The responses to the questionnaire were grouped and re-grouped until they fell into what seemed to be logical categories. Five relatively discrete points of view were identified. A few sociologists were *indifferent*, some were *opposed* to general education, many suggested *adaptation* to it by changing existing courses or by adding new courses in the department of sociology, while others accepted the inter-disciplinary, inter-departmental approach provided that sociologists *dominated* the development, and finally a small group were willing to *co-operate* in any way necessary in a general education program.

1. *The Indifferent.* Some sociologists are primarily interested in research and make extensive use of the questionnaire as one means of securing data. A few who responded said nothing about their attitudes toward general education, but commented at length on the inadequacy of this questionnaire as a research instrument. The following are typical:

I find this questionnaire frustrating . . . (and gave three good reasons for his reaction).

Assuming that your questionnaire goes to institutions of varying size and complexity of organization, the returns . . . would not be comparable.

The questions are confusing. . . . It might be well to restate the questions, if it is not already too late to do so.

2. *The Opposed.* A second group of sociologists ignored the defects of the questionnaire but not what they believed to be the defects of general education.

I am not impressed with the efforts at integration . . . General Education, which turns out quite often to be superficial education, is likely in my opinion to be more harmful in Sociology . . .

. . . The effectiveness of so-called general education courses has not been demonstrated. . . . They try to do for the student what the student should do for himself.

We have strong reservations concerning the advisability

of encouraging the development of 'general education' courses and . . . believe that their present popularity is nothing more than a post-war vogue, prompted in part by the seemingly impressive Harvard and Columbia reports on general education.

So-called 'integrated' courses accomplished nothing which can't be accomplished in independent courses.

. . . We can best serve 'general education' by subjecting the student to good stiff doses of the separate disciplines taught by specialists. . . . Let us be sure that sociology is presented by *sociologists* as *sociology* . . .

There is no reason to doubt the honesty, sincerity or concern of those who oppose general education for most of them saw in this trend a serious threat to sociology. No doubt these sociologists spoke for the many who actively or passively oppose the introduction of general education courses in their respective institutions.

3. The *Adapters*. It appeared that a majority of the sociologists who responded to the questionnaire did not believe that there was a serious problem. Apparently, many thought that sociology courses were general education courses. Those who did see problems, believed they were minor ones which could be met by adapting existing courses to changing needs or by introducing new courses in the sociology department.

Most of the sociology courses offered to undergraduates in . . . really are general education courses.

Our basic course is designed for general education rather than as strictly preparatory for more advanced and specialized courses in sociology, although it serves the latter purposes also.

. . . Such courses in sociology as *Marriage* for freshmen and sophomores, *The Family* for juniors and seniors, and *Introduction to Sociology* and *Introduction to Cultural Anthropology* are general education courses.

In order to secure some evidence on current adaptations in the various departments of sociology the chairmen were asked to name the one course in the department which had the largest annual enrolment. As might be expected, it was the Principles, Introductory, or General Sociology course in 69 of the 95 institutions (73%). In some institutions, the needs of students who were not going to major in sociology greatly influenced the content of the beginning course. However, other courses were named

by chairmen in 22 institutions. In ten of the 22 institutions the course with the largest annual enrolment had "marriage," "family," "courtship," and/or "personal adjustment" in the title. Other courses named were social problems, criminology, race relations, general anthropology, social psychology, community behavior and educational sociology. Some departmental chairmen reported that they also offered service courses specifically developed for certain curricula, such as a sociology course for nurses.

Several pointed out, in support of their position that the best policy is to adapt to educational trends by making changes within the sociology department, that it is easier to work out adaptations in one department than in two or more departments, as is often necessary in the case of general education. One frankly said,

If we can develop the right kind of introductory course in our department, I am convinced there will be no demand for general education in our university.

4. *The Dominators.* There are other sociologists who accepted the general education movement and inter-departmental cooperation, but insisted that the social science general education course ought to be developed and administered by sociologists. Two reported that historians had taken over the general education program at their schools and implied that this was unfortunate. The case for leadership by sociologists in general education is presented as follows:

Sociology can, should, and (I believe) does make a major and indispensable contribution to general education. . . . In my thinking, sociology offers a substantial core and the most feasible frame of reference available for developing an interdisciplinary, integrated course in the social sciences.

By training and disposition it appears to me that the instructors of sociology are better prepared to direct general education on the college level than the majority of faculty members. We give three well integrated general education sequences . . . presenting the material in the form of functional units. The broadly educated sociologist is well fitted to participate, even to take major leadership.

5. *The Cooperators.* A few sociologists did not see anything in the general education movement to fight, to forestall by course adaptation, or to take over by exercising leadership. Two reported simply:

We have developed Human Relations as a general education course and as an inter-disciplinary field—it is now established as a separate department, though manned mostly by sociologists.

The course is under the supervision of the Social Studies Division of which the Sociology Department is a part.

Some indicated that general education involves more than structural change; it involves a change in objectives, course materials, and even in methods of instruction. According to them, the purpose of a general education program is to meet the needs of students, both their common vocational needs and their common non-vocational needs in our democratic society. Therefore, it is necessary to identify these needs carefully, secure appropriate materials from the specialized fields in order to meet these needs, and finally, evaluate results. This places the needs of the individual and our society first, ahead of the requirements for proficiency in the specialized area.

#### *An Evaluation*

Five typical points of view toward general education frequently found among specialists have been presented. Let us now evaluate each in relation to the problems of developing a general education program.

The first point of view can be dismissed with little consideration because those engaged in research are not going to be interested in curricular changes as long as such changes do not threaten their freedom to continue to do research. What they want mainly is to be let alone.

The second point of view must be taken seriously for it is the one held by the outspoken critics of general education. It is difficult to communicate with the opponents of general education for the climate of discussion is so charged with emotion that what starts out to be a calm discussion often breaks down into a series of charges and countercharges. Infinite patience and understanding are essential. The proponents of general education should be cautious in criticizing the outcomes of specialized education and quick to admit the obvious shortcomings of many of the early efforts in general education. They should also be alert and sympathetic to the personal element in the situation for sometimes the most vocal and aggressive critics feel personally threatened by the proposed changes in the curriculum.



The advocates of general education may view the third point of view with mixed feelings. Those who would adapt their courses appear to be in favor of general education; but they wish to teach the courses themselves and in their own departments. Possibly this is the best way to introduce general education courses in many institutions, because any interested department can go ahead without waiting for other departments. It may be practically impossible to get the formal inter-departmental cooperation in the larger schools which is essential. Some supporters of general education may be impatient with this approach because it is slow and lacks some of the formal aspects of the inter-disciplinary approach. However, a successful demonstration on a small scale may result in the later adoption of a more extensive program of general education.

Possibly, the fourth point of view is as much a threat to the development of general education as the second. Thus, if a specialist takes early leadership in an inter-disciplinary undertaking in order to advance his own field, he may discredit the program. If, on the other hand, he merely exercises leadership and grows in the process by becoming more and more familiar with the related fields, the program will be strengthened. For instance, one of the very important questions is whether the conceptual framework used in the new program shall be taken merely from one of the specialized areas of knowledge or whether a new framework shall be developed. Probably what happens depends to a large degree on the personal characteristics of the chairman of the inter-departmental venture.

Even the fifth point of view may have possible limitations, though at first glance it appears to be the most propitious for the development of general education. The danger is that individuals who are soundly rooted in specialized areas of learning may sever their connections with these fields when they turn to general education. It must always be remembered that general education should not be thought of as an alternate to specialized education, but, as a complement. We need both specialized education *and* general education. The goals in general education may be identified by studying society and students, but the content must always come from the specialized areas of inquiry. Therefore, if an individual does not continue to keep up in his specialized field, he becomes progressively less able to contribute

to general education. It may be that a person from a specialized area of knowledge must give up his research, but he must keep abreast with the significant developments in his field, if he is to make his full contribution to general education.

### *Conclusion*

All who are interested in the development of a general education program must recognize and understand the points of view identified in this article. It may be even that each is necessary for the sound development of general education. The critics point out mistakes and deflate unjustified claims; the adapters demonstrate on a small scale what can be done and take a step toward general education; the dominators hold the new program together until they either see the possibilities in general education or their one-sidedness is recognized and they are replaced; the cooperators from the various specialized areas draw essential materials from their respective fields for use in general education; and even the indifferent contribute indirectly through specialized research. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that these attitudes will be found among the specialists on any campus in such balance that they provide the ideal conditions for the development of a general education program. For this reason the problems of administrators are similar but not identical.

## UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS FOR LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

DAVID LEVINSON

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, OHIO UNIVERSITY

**I**N recent years colleges and universities have demonstrated a growing interest in servicing the training and educational needs of persons engaged in industrial management. A number of the more prominent universities already have established programs for such persons; and many others, it appears, either have lately instituted programs, are involved in the planning stages or are seriously considering the feasibility of entering the field. In addition to the laudatory ambition of being of service to management, the interest of universities in management education undoubtedly has other stimulants: once in successful operation such programs may be somewhat lucrative for the university; the establishment and cementing of contacts with industrial executives may mean an added source of financial contributions to the university's scholarship funds, developmental programs, etc.; these same contacts may provide avenues for the job placement of the university graduates; and for state-supported institutions, the service provided management is one of the realistic ways of fashioning favorable public opinion, which in turn contains the hope of a generous disposition by the state legislature of the institution's budgetary requests. Most colleges and universities would be other than human institutions if they manifested no interest in such prizes.

University interest, likewise, has expanded in educational offerings for the ordinary members and officers of labor unions. Increasingly our institutions of higher learning are realizing that labor unions have as much right to call upon their services as do industry and agriculture. This awareness has been heightened by the fact that lately an extraneous flow of money for labor education has been channeled to universities already in that field—from the Ford and Carnegie foundations, the Mutual Security Agency and here and there by way of state legislature appropriations. It is also likely that within the next several years

Congress itself may appropriate sums for labor education. Certainly labor-union spokesmen in the corridors of Congress are active with that end in view. They seem to have a most worthy cause when they point, by way of comparison, to Congressional appropriations for agricultural extension work and for assistance to business. Should this extra source of funds materialize, those universities with established and "accreditable" programs would tend to benefit liberally.

As interest in labor and management education continues to unfold, it might be well to reflect upon the problems which a university must resolve in embarking upon such programs. The purpose of this paper is to identify many of those problems, to suggest possible solutions and to interject an occasional word of caution.

The planning of the program should be initiated through a comparative inventory of the university's plant facilities and personnel capacities against the needs of those whom the university aims to serve. The educational needs of labor and management personnel, presumably those who are located within the "geographic jurisdiction" of the university, must be recorded. In this sounding-out process there is an opportunity, of course, for the recruitment of enrollees.

In the main, existing programs for management cater either to the foremen's level in industry or to the various levels of management above that. In the foremen's programs the emphasis typically is upon job training—how to improve one's job performance; for the higher levels of management, upon executive development—how to assume the responsibilities which come with promotion. The basic objective of the latter is to expand the participant's viewpoint from his presumably department-wide or division-wide focus to one that is company-wide. It is reported that one such program enjoys a ratio of ten applications for each enrollee which the university can accept, an indication—if accurate—of the opportunities for universities in this field.

Classified according to subject matter, university programs for labor unions have various facets. One type, aimed at the rank-and-file membership, is pragmatic to the point of being concerned with any subject for which there is an expressed want. To the extent that the subjects taught have no relation to labor union-

ism, the program becomes nothing more than adult education limited in its enrolment to the labor union group. A second attempts to teach such union officials as shop stewards and committeemen how to perform their duties of office more effectively. A third type constitutes job training for trade union technicians, such as those engaged in labor education or labor journalism. A fourth, based upon some broad political or economic issue, apparently serves anyone at all who regards himself as an activist in the labor movement. Finally, there is one notable case of a program at the university level which seeks to develop the administrative ability of labor-union leaders and parallels in its significance the executive development program for management.

In recruiting enrollees for a management program, the parties who dare not be ignored communicatively are the top executives. The recruiter may devote considerable time and effort in impressing auxiliary management representatives, as the training director or personnel director, with the desirability of his program. Yet he may find that they in turn have been unable to impress adequately that person whose approval is decisive for enrolling company personnel in the program. It is worth noting too that in many an industrial area the "intellectual pace" for management thinking is set by perhaps one or a few of the top executives of the firms in that area. If the university's program can obtain the indorsement of these strategic people, the job of recruitment generally is facilitated. In some cases the best time to seek a definite commitment from management is in the fall of the year, when the firm's manpower budget for the ensuing year has yet to be delineated. In that manner management is given sufficient time to arrange to replace on the job those of its personnel who are assigned to the university's program. In other cases the seasonal nature of a firm's operations would dictate the timing underlying recruitment efforts.

It must not be assumed that success in recruitment is invariably unexacting. In the abstract, of course, management is always in favor of educating its personnel. But it appears that industrial executives, to the extent that they take pride in their managerial efficiency, arrange for their subordinates at least a bit more work than such personnel can be expected to do comfortably. Given a specific situation, the prospective enrollee

may have "too much work to do to be spared from his job at this time, but perhaps next year. . . ." In many instances, then, a sizable amount of "sales promotion" for the university's program may be required.

Among the labor unions the parties who finally must be attracted again are the top executives. Here the problem generally may be more delicate than it is with respect to management. In the first place, a labor organization, particularly a local union, reputedly being different from a business firm in that it is in part a "political" instrument, may lack the efficiency consciousness or administrative sophistication which is characteristic of industrial bureaucracy. Thereby it may tend to have less appreciation than management of how education and training may help it achieve its goals. Where it does plan for such matters the arrangements may be merely haphazard or subject, for one reason or another, to impending postponement or dissolution. A prospective strike, union election or convention may provide the excuse. Secondly, to the extent that labor officials lack the benefit of a higher education they may tend to rationalize the uneasiness or inferiority they feel in the presence of so-called intellectuals by insisting that there is nothing to be learned from "those ivory-tower professors." Third, there is many a local union which, in terms of finances, lives a precarious existence. It would be prohibitive for such an organization to underwrite the cost of educating some of its personnel, particularly where, as required by some university programs, the major item of expense is the replacement of earnings which a person foregoes in temporarily leaving his job to participate in the program. The cushioning effect which management enjoys in deducting costs of education, a business expense, against its income tax does not apply, of course, in the case of a union. It is no coincidence that the most successful labor-education programs offered by universities are those which are state subsidized and either are of comparatively short duration or make no demands on a person's working time. One may venture the opinion, however, that even though a union may plead poverty, like many another institution, it can amass the funds somehow if it has the felt need. Fourth, there are a number of unions which have their own education programs. For certain of their purposes, such



as the training of union organizers, the educational offerings which could be expected of a university would be simply inadequate. Finally, many union spokesmen are suspicious of the motives behind university programs for labor, fearing that the object may be to convince labor of the virtue of management's viewpoint in union-management relations. Unfortunately, some occurrences in the past may be interpreted to support that belief.

Without the cooperation of labor-union officials, a university program for labor is doomed to fail. By-passing the union organization in a general invitation to union people to participate in some kind of a university program is a fruitless gesture, for there are no effective channels of recruitment. Such has been the experience of those universities which have tried it. If the university is sincere in instituting a labor program, it must be equally sincere in gaining the confidence of labor unions. A fatal error is to impose upon labor unions an educational bill-of-fare which someone else thinks is "good for them." The unions must be given a voice—an emphatic voice even if nominally advisory—in the planning and execution of the program. There must be mutual agreement between the participating unions and the university with respect to the objectives of the program, its duration, the choice of faculty, course materials and a host of other matters. Within the organization of the university, the program should be insulated against exclusive control by the college of commerce or school of business, if not completely divorced therefrom, to allay union fears that the program is management oriented. In offering its hand in sincere cooperation the university, needless to say, must not surrender its own right of veto anymore than it can expect the unions to surrender theirs.

The choice of faculty is a most sensitive problem. Continuing success in the recruitment of enrollees depends mainly upon the word-of-mouth recommendations of those who have participated in the program. No single factor influences the nature of those recommendations as much as does faculty performance. Standards of teaching performance should be set very high but at the same time the participating faculty should be well compensated. To conserve finances, university administrators, particularly those who operate under close budgets, may be tempted to distribute teaching assignments to members of the regular faculty

and to pay them merely a marginal increment. If so, the program is foredoomed to meet its deserved end. Unsatisfactory compensation schedules will hardly attract the preferred teachers. If those instructors, nevertheless, feel obligated to accept the low-paying assignments simply to retain the good will of the administration, their morale, and consequently the excellence of their job performance, will be jeopardized. The program must be primary in the considerations of those who are responsible for its success, not "something extra."

Another temptation of the administration may be to employ as instructor a so-called outside expert of wide reputation, whose name, it is hoped, will serve as a strong recruitment attraction. If he teaches courses which a regular member of the faculty is equipped to handle and if he is compensated exorbitantly as compared to regular rates of pay, his presence is a most torturing way of breaking faculty morale.

Even though the university is successful in confining its proffered program largely to subject-matter areas where it is strong, there undoubtedly will be some teaching inadequacies for a labor or management program among the regular faculty members. Qualified outsiders should be considered for assignments which no faculty member is prepared to handle. In the labor program, the ideal instructor or discussion leader is one who has work experience similar to that of the students, an understanding of the norms and goals of the labor movement and teaching experience in adult education—which presupposes student participation and the absence of authoritarian attitudes in the instructor. This combination of qualifications may be difficult to find within the faculty. Certainly the worst choice of instructors would be one who fits the conventional stereotype of a college professor. Where the union involved has its own education department, the personnel of that staff, those very persons who assist the university administration in planning and executing the program, are normally available for teaching assignments. There, likewise, may be inadequacies in the management program. The ideal instructor or discussion leader in this instance should have, among other qualifications, a rich background of experience in industrial management generally or in the subject of his particular concern. In the main, the smaller the university the less is

the possibility of finding the necessary talent within its own faculty.

To some degree, a subject-matter deficiency of the instructor may be neutralized if he employs the case method of teaching. The case method "means many things to many people," but it may be used to delimit the role of the instructor so that, though remaining an integral part of the teaching process, he functions as a kind of parliamentarian, an organizer of ideas and summarizer. In this way the students, in effect, talk to each other and learn from the wealth of their combined experience. The instructor's experiential inadequacies are not of prime consequence. Although the case method, furthermore, is not the only educational device which emphasizes student participation, it certainly is preferable on that score to the lecture method of instruction.

The choice between conducting an in-residence or extension program is influenced in part by the adequacy of the university's physical plant. If the university does not have already-established housing and meeting facilities or is unable to improvise them, it may have to forego any in-residence labor or management program during the regular school term. Of necessity it might limit itself to off-campus offerings and to on-campus activities during the summer months.

Given an in-residence program, attention should be paid to the adequacy of recreational facilities and the environment in general. A campus located, for example, where the townspeople are known to practice racial discrimination would not be an ideal site, at its best, for a labor program. Other seemingly unsolvable problems may develop. The writer knows of a case in which a group of management trainees, to escape the unbearably hot weather, abandoned the summer program of one university and transferred to a campus located to the north. In general, the matter of extraneous facilities and recreational conveniences warrants more consideration in labor than in management programs. Management enrollees can better afford to provide such conveniences at their own expense. It appears, furthermore, that union personnel are more inclined to mix a larger quantity of the vacation ingredient into their educational programs than does management.

Because of limitations upon the enrollees' time as well as of physical facilities, it may be necessary to drastically restrict the duration of the program. Here it may be feasible to reduce the number of course offerings as against a reduction in the length of time devoted to each course. Likewise, a "come-back" sequence might not be out of place; for example, a program of six weeks' duration could be conducted for three weeks in each of two consecutive years. A divided program of this kind, however, might involve considerable risk of non-completion, particularly on the part of labor enrollees who hold elective office in their unions.

There are some educators who have their own favorite notions about labor and management programs. Their great concern is the promotion of peaceful industrial relations, and they feel that the basic problem is one of human relations—that labor and management "don't really understand" each other. Their thinking parallels the familiar assertion about international relations, that we cannot have genuine peace unless the United States and Russia really learn to understand each other. Given a university sponsored in-residence undertaking, these educators propose that labor and management enrollees should be combined in a single program.

In reality, there is no point to labor and management personnel taking courses together except for those in which they have a common interest. Labor has no concern with, let us say, the subject of marketing policy, while management is equally disinterested in one entitled union counseling. The common denominator of interest is found primarily in collective bargaining subjects. But a program of some duration devoted exclusively to such subjects probably is one which labor unions particularly would not care to join. Labor generally insists that in labor education another consideration has primacy over, or at least equality with, the matter of peaceful industrial relations—the question of how to build a stronger, more united and more active labor union. Unless a program, other than a very brief affair, devotes some attention to that matter, unions have little use for it.

This does not imply that, given separate but simultaneous programs, the labor and management enrollees, if they are educationally homogeneous, dare not come together in activities which

overlap. They can jointly participate in industrial relations courses and "learn to know each other" in that manner, they can enjoy common coffee hours, they can collectively entertain visiting speakers; all this can occur depending upon the particular situation—upon the emotional maturity of the enrollees and the state of collective bargaining among the organizations they represent. In exceptional cases, bargaining relations may be so tenuous that a person, even on a college campus, may feel that he must maintain an adversary position not merely with respect to the other party who actually bargains with him or his organization, but also with respect to anyone else of the same stripe. If this is the prevailing attitude, combined courses will be conducted in an atmosphere of suspicion and antagonism. In other situations, labor unions, as a matter of deliberate policy, may refuse to participate in such courses, claiming that the object or effect thereof is to dilute labor's militancy. In the combined courses about which the writer has first-hand knowledge, however, the labor and management enrollees do seem to get along well and to profit from each other's participation.

In their anxiety to promote mutual understanding, some educators propose not only that labor and management participants be combined in the same program, but also that they should live together. Such schemes are suggested, for example, as one representative of management and one of labor sharing the same dormitory quarters.

In that circumstance, however, there is a question not merely of intellectual acceptance among the enrollees but of social acceptance—not of the type which occurs during a casual meeting, but akin to that which governs the relationship between members of the same family, between those who live under the same roof. This relationship, furthermore, is intended to be sustained—that is, for the duration of the program. There normally will be found so large a difference in the incomes of the labor and management enrollees as to make them, even though educationally homogeneous, socially incompatible both in terms of what they are accustomed to and what they can afford. To put it rather primitively, how can a spirit of *camaraderie* develop where one person can afford only to drink beer while the other enjoys liqueur? The writer knows of a case, for example, where the

requirement of a twenty-dollar fee made it uneconomical for the labor enrollees to utilize the same dining facilities which the management enrollees enjoyed.

One might insist, nevertheless, that the enrollees should be quartered together precisely to learn about each other's differences. But where participation depends upon the voluntary choice of the enrollees, it is difficult to see what could be done to overcome what evidently would develop into a distaste for and resistance to a "living-together" arrangement.

All this is not to say that a program requiring the participants to live together cannot possibly succeed. Policy must be based upon the probable, not the possible. The probability is that it will not succeed.

Despite the many difficulties which loom large, the interest of universities in labor and management education warrants encouragement. It seems that here is another area of fruitful university endeavor. Lest the writer has overstressed the "crassly economic" motives, it is well to be reminded that there is a rewarding satisfaction which comes from merely being of service, regardless of the fact that such service may yield not an additional penny for the university coffers.



## EDUCATIONAL GOALS FOR COLLEGE WOMEN

ELEANOR F. DOLAN

HIGHER EDUCATION ASSOCIATE, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF  
UNIVERSITY WOMEN

**C**OLLEGES have graduated an increasing number of women over the generations until now we have the largest total number ever in our population. Doubtless, the size of this group is one reason why there has been so much manifest concern in the last few years about the education of women. Most of the writing and speech making and curriculum reporting, and there has been plenty of it, has centered on planning the most valuable undergraduate program for college women. And they are still debating which is the best plan.

Some of the factors complicating this important discussion are well known. Women had to prove themselves mentally and physically fit and educationally ready for higher education: they had to overcome ignorant prejudice, discriminatory practices of many types and face financial handicaps. These historical situations were barriers to an easy and natural acceptance of women as persons in higher education, but thanks to improved research, especially in psychology and anthropology, and to the good will and assistance of men colleagues, and to the fine work of women themselves, misconceptions are gradually being worn away, and improvements being made on the remaining problems. Furthermore, the realization is growing that there are other important and untouched problems to be diagnosed and treated before college women will be able to realize their full powers in modern America.

Two of these problems worth the solution are:

- (1) What more can be done to help college girls to discover those goals in life which they genuinely value, and to make plans to achieve them?
- (2) Assuming that alumnae believe they have an obligation to contribute at all times in their lives their best to society, what more can the college do to see that when the alumnae seek gainful employment they are prepared for it and find it available?

It is impossible even to touch upon many of the elements of these two problems. For example, what the employer's part in the second problem might be is a study in itself. It would be illuminating to have an answer to the first question before tackling the second, but instead they must be worked on together. The statistics of married women gainfully employed outside the home indicate that a vastly increased number of them are making that an important part of their lives. Comment here can be directed only to participation by the college in the solutions.

There are today 2,533,050 women college graduates<sup>1</sup> over 18 years of age in our population and since 1940 the colleges have been adding an annual total number which has increased from 76,000 to over 100,000. Even in numbers this is no small problem. Are colleges aware of the importance of these figures in relation to the two problems stated? Judging from the written material available, one would be forced to the conclusion that they are not. (It is hoped this relationship will be one of the problems studied by the Commission on Women of the American Council on Education.) Judging from what colleges do about them, one would reach the same conclusion. Yet here are thousands of able, well-trained, eager young people being turned loose in society to lead or not to lead, as ill-assorted forces shall determine. So far, it is a "sink or swim" process, which has been proved wasteful in other enterprises. *To lead* is the reason for higher education, and for the faith and sacrifice of earlier generations which have preserved this opportunity. It is obvious that whatever the college can do to assist further on either of the problems suggested, will help to assure for the United States a larger share of trained leadership.

In several recent studies concerning college women and their work, the first problem is evident: What do college women want most of all in life? Professor Ginzberg<sup>2</sup> and Professor Komarovsky<sup>3</sup> are two who have queried college women on this, and the

<sup>1</sup> A college graduate is defined as one who has completed four or more years of college work.

<sup>2</sup> Ginzberg, Eli, et al. *Occupational Choice*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1951, pp. 163-4.

<sup>3</sup> Komarovsky, Mirra. *Women in the Modern World*. Little Brown & Co., Boston, 1953, p. 92 ff.

answers from the undergraduates frequently stress marriage as of final value, seemingly considering it an unchanging and unchangeable state. The answers show also how seldom other plans are in progress. This is understandable but wasteful. As the replies represent a strong group opinion among college girls, it is one segment of the total problem with which the college has to reckon.

Older women college graduates also attach a very great deal of importance to marriage, but in their replies one finds more realism in their concept of marriage and also the value these women are placing upon a life pattern which includes their personal and professional development as individuals, with or without marriage. It should also be noted that Professor Komarovsky<sup>4</sup> has found improvement in the attitude toward individual development among undergraduate girls. The college is in a key position to influence this deepening and broadening understanding for both groups.

The college will readily recognize the causes behind the replies of undergraduate women. The social pressures are heavily weighted in favor of early marriage. Families, war, the girl's own contemporaries, these create strong pressure. One should also add the publicity given to the slight present surplus in this country of women of marriageable years over men, and the little information circulated about the fact that the reverse is true for the young people in college and for the college-educated population. The force of all these together goes far to account for the too-limited planning of college women students. The help of the college is obviously needed for the girls to find a true perspective of their life work. This is necessary not only to prevent feelings of insecurity and frustration often expressed by the older married college graduate, but also to eliminate the frittering away of the early post-college years which later are found to be so important to advancement in a career.

Recognizing the problems and desiring to help, can the colleges do more? One contributing act would be for the colleges to clarify their own unique obligations. The attendant results upon the program of the college and upon the work of the stu-

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 95.

dents defy estimation. In 1950, Dr. Carmichael<sup>5</sup> urged this, saying:

No consistent, clear-cut philosophy of American higher education has yet been formulated. . . . The great need today is for a modern restatement of the function of higher education, a redefinition of the college and its purpose, and a reformulation of the fundamental goals of the University.

One might be permitted to hazard that one effect of such clarification on students would be less confusion in their thinking and a better-realized system of personal values, which might well be demonstrated by the girls in their approach to this problem of permanent values and planning.

To formulate an educational philosophy is a pretty big undertaking, but worth the try. Success, and even the discussion during the struggle toward success, would restore to teachers and other counselors their overlaid vision of the relation of their work to the objective of the whole college program. Precept and example would have more reality than was previously possible for young people, giving them more stability upon which to make rational plans. Because of the pressures already mentioned, this is difficult to get across to young women, but the colleges must succeed.

It is only fair to say right here that families have a major share in creating in their daughters a habit of clear thinking. Mention of families brings up another aspect of college responsibility which has been seldom emphasized. The colleges trained many of these parents and perhaps the colleges should expect more help from the families in terms of the children's standards of values. Havemann and West<sup>6</sup> in *They Went to College* (the Time study) provide the evidence that these "college families" could be a stronger social force. They report that 32% of the men college graduates and 44% of the women had at least one parent who had gone to college. Shosteck<sup>7</sup> in his Report rein-

<sup>5</sup> Carmichael, Oliver C. *Report of the President*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1949-50, p. 21.

<sup>6</sup> Havemann, Ernest and West, Patricia S. *They Went to College*. Harcourt Brace & Co., New York, 1952, pp. 14-15.

<sup>7</sup> Shosteck, Robert. *Five Thousand Liberal Arts Graduates Report*. B'nai B'rith Vocational Service, Washington, D. C., 1953, p. 9.

forces this investigation when he writes, "almost 6 out of 10 recent women liberal arts graduates come from college families." In 1949 *Fortune*<sup>8</sup> conducted a survey of higher education and in response to questions concerning college education for young women, college graduates, more than the population as a whole, said they wanted college for their girls. Also college parents placed top emphasis on what the college could do for these girls in terms of developing in them the "intelligence and wisdom necessary to live a full life."

Experts have stated that the *Time* study figures are typical of the American college pattern. As this is true and is supplemented by other studies and since these college-educated parents exert strong if sometimes unwitting pressure toward goals which they only partially understand themselves, is it unfair to ask the colleges to think about the effectiveness of their own teaching and consciously take steps to improve it?

There are happier sides to this picture: The *Fortune* report that college families place more importance upon college education for their girls than the general population; a genuine trend toward more and more college-educated families; cultural improvement from one generation to the next. Furthermore, if the colleges capitalize on the increasing number of "college families" for more than sentimental reasons, a quickened rate of improvement may be the reward.

Whatever the past may be, it is clear that both the family and the college which has shared in its education have a major responsibility to help young women plan to fulfill their role as persons and citizens. Any family, as it thinks of this problem, will recognize many lost opportunities within itself and within its community for encouragement to young women to think far ahead and make decisions on rational grounds. Professor Ruth Benedict<sup>9</sup> wrote, "No society has yet attempted a self-conscious direction of the process by which its new normalities are created in the next generation." Maybe the colleges could take heed more consciously of this opportunity, or, put in the reverse way,

<sup>8</sup> *Higher Education*. The *Fortune* survey conducted by Elmo Roper. Published as a supplement to *Fortune*, September, 1949. See pp. 5 & 7.

<sup>9</sup> Benedict, Ruth. *Patterns of Culture*. New American Library, New York, (originally published in 1934), p. 251.



make their men and women graduates more conscious of their obligation to improve on the performance of their predecessors.

The college has the resources which should be directed to help young women think through the contribution each individual may be best qualified to make. There is a reality in colleges, as elsewhere, which is a "climate of opinion." This climate exerts a significant force in the lives of women and of men, particularly the young ones. It is a compound of many factors, a large portion of them intangible. Too often persons in the colleges have lamented that they could do nothing about this, but obviously this is not true. Each person can do something. If the situation is recognized and taken in hand by the college as a whole, much can be done. Clarification of college purpose—which includes the full contribution of its women students—will affect the college climate. For the sake of its undergraduate women, the climate of opinion should be favorable to developing self-respect in women themselves and in helping them consciously plan for their future.

Colleges can do a great deal more than they are doing at present to help women develop pride in themselves. In this connection, many will remind the colleges that they themselves should encourage this pride by recognizing women's qualities more frequently with posts of leadership and responsibility. Alas, that recognition is too infrequent by far, albeit there is some genuine excuse, as there is a somewhat limited supply of trained women. In this connection it may be significant that lack of pride for the reputation of women has too often made women themselves heedless of the chances offered them. Increased self-respect will increase their sense of responsibility.

If the college could provide opportunities for the men students to see women as people and to learn to want them to continue to be responsible, contributing individuals in their own right, it would do a lot to create the desired climate. For their own sake, not to mention the girls' welfare, strong emphasis along these lines is advocated. Montagu<sup>10</sup> wrote recently:

Men are altering their attitudes toward women, and have been doing so for more than a hundred years, but their atti-

<sup>10</sup> Montagu, Ashley. *The Natural Superiority of Women*. Macmillan, New York, 1953, p. 162.



tudes must undergo this final change; namely, that where they may have retained any doubts about the right of women to complete equality as a human being and as a citizen they must shed their doubts and freely grant women that right.

The college can assist in this realization.

Possibly a greater respect for herself will be a strong reason for the college girl to begin to understand and appreciate what the college is trying to do for her in urging her to establish her full individual values, to interest her in planning ahead more thoughtfully and in terms of the long range. At present statistics show that over 50% of college women in their twenties—married and unmarried—are in gainful employment. These women should not be just killing time or working for a pay check. Like their brothers, they should have planned this work experience with reference to a career interest. These are the apprentice years during which a career is built and if they are foolishly spent, the damage to a career is difficult, if not impossible, to repair. The colleges are already trying to bring this home to their girls, but they would and could do more were they fully aware first, of the total of their women graduates who are in the labor force, and second, of the large number of these who are or have been married. At present much of college employment counseling to the undergraduate is predicated on the traditional pattern of single women working outside the home and all others working in the home. This one-time pattern has radically changed. Advice to undergraduate and graduate women should be readjusted forthwith.

Thus are we brought to consider the second major problem: What more can the college do to prepare its women for gainful employment?

In 1950, of the 2,533,050 women college graduates in our population, 1,252,050 were in the labor force. The Census Bureau has reported that 673,380 of the first total had never been married (26.6%), but so far they have not calculated exactly what proportion of college women in the labor force are single. A "horseback estimate" among persons familiar with the whole problem, and particularly with statistics, is that about 85% of the college women who are single are in the labor force. From a combination of data, one can guess that the total percentage

will be large. There is a census figure for 1950 which offers an interesting comparison though it does not deal exclusively with those who have never married. It is that for all women 25 years and over, exclusive of those "married and with husband present," the rate of participation in the labor force is 43.9%. Traditionally, it is the group of single alumnae which the college has visualized when it has considered its women graduates gainfully employed outside the home.

Consideration of the demands of a career for single women needs more conscious attention from the college after the girl has graduated. Such a service would go a long way to eliminate wasteful stop-gap employment and such attitudes as Professor Howard Mumford Jones thought he observed in the modern college girl which caused him to write that she had "virtually ceased to challenge my intellectual curiosity, and . . . I feel she has let us all down."<sup>11</sup> It seems very possible that much of this assistance could be programmed through the alumnae organization and in conjunction with similar attention to the needs of married alumnae whose employment problems are equally sizable though different.

The married college woman in gainful employment presents a new and growing problem to the college. According to the 1950 census, there were 1,252,050 college women in the labor force. Of these, we know 507,840 were married and residing with their husbands and also gainfully employed outside the home. This is 40.56% of the total. To get a true picture of the size of this problem, comparison should be made with the number of college women in the labor force who have married at least once but whose husbands are absent, but this figure is not presently available. Further significance is added to this problem if one compares the 40.56% with the percentage for all women in the United States 25 years and older who are married and living with their husbands and are also in the labor force. That figure is 21.1%.

The immensity of the problem faced by the college attempting to assist married women graduates with their employment is evi-

<sup>11</sup> Jones, Howard Mumford. "Have College Women Let Us Down?", in *Mademoiselle*, January 1952, p. 128.

dent. There are two major groups into which these graduates fall, (1) those who must work for their own or their families' support and (2) those whose desire to work is based on other reasons. Assistance to the first of these can be considered either with that for the single or married women, depending upon the specific situation, but the very existence of the second group needs comment. The need to conserve our human resources is involved as is also the problem of the college woman who marries and has a family and who finds that for her personal growth and happiness she must have some life outside her home. There is plenty of sound evidence that this is a real problem. It takes many forms. There is the young married graduate who says apologetically, "Oh, I'm just a housewife," or, "The children keep me so busy at home I do not have time for outside activity." Still another young married woman will speak wistfully of her "staleness" in the area which excited her enthusiasm in college. And there is the very large group of older college women, with families grown and independent, who are feverishly engaged in volunteer work, which may or may not capitalize on their earlier training, or others moping or utterly at a loss without their quondam family obligations.

Acceptance by the college of responsibility to these graduates seems desirable from the view of the women, the college and the country. It is maintained that the college is well adapted to this service. As our graduates leave the college, they are, on the whole, full of idealism and enthusiasm; they are up to date and informed, and many of them have better habits of working with material of their special interest than they will have after a few years, unless the college takes action to keep them informed and alert. Such action, it should be quickly stated, must involve plans to free a busy young mother so that she has time to take advantage of the new opportunity and in addition free her with energy left to want to move ahead. Such planning is strongly advocated not only for the benefit to the women themselves, but equally because of the benefit to society from the intelligent conservation of human resources.

The evidence so far seems to be that college women themselves would welcome the opportunity for their continued development,

later if not sooner. A natural projection of the college campaign to plan ahead during undergraduate days is assistance to married alumnae to keep abreast until the time of freedom from household routines. Such activity should contribute importantly to family happiness and further would stimulate graduates to contribute intellectually to the sum of our nation's knowledge. This is not to say that every married woman should simultaneously undertake a second career outside the home. It does strongly suggest that with the help of our institutions of higher education, college-bred wives should expect in the future to move ahead in their fields of special interest continuously, maintaining themselves fit and ready to participate in another way when adjustment in family obligations makes it feasible or necessary.

Many of these comments seem to have been directed to the young married graduate rather than to the more experienced one. They apply to both; indeed, among the group in their middle-thirties whose youngsters now are in school, and among those in their forties and fifties with families wholly independent, this need to release energies and abilities in different ways has created many problems which require immediate attention. These older groups show clearly the depth of this problem for which the assistance of the colleges is being asked. Many have tried to solve their own problems, incidentally showing up the inadequacy of the help available to them. Some have turned to the college for re-training or refresher course instruction. Some have found the last satisfactory, but many others report that colleges have not yet adapted themselves well to this need. This should be a real challenge to the college.

Colleges *are* well adapted to meet this need. In this connection, factors such as teaching and research staff, equipment, and geographical availability are determinants which one readily sees, but the factor which has been woefully neglected is the alumnae organization. Here is a hand-forged tool through which the colleges could operate to reach their graduates, to channel their needs and to meet them. The colleges will undoubtedly see the ancillary advantage to them in this opportunity to give vitality and purpose to the alumnae organization and to shift to it some of the financial or other management-responsibility of this post-college education.

Colleges know that these associations have reached such a size and such perfection of organization that they are looking for further worlds to conquer. Their present jobs in vital statistics and finance are not sufficient. Here, the colleges should suggest, is a great and needed educational service just meant for them. Indeed, they have even made a beginning through the so-called "alumnae colleges" added by some women's colleges to reunion programs, or similar brief refresher programs for graduates who visit the campus at other times. Colleges which have developed special brief courses for specialized groups could share with the alumnae associations their techniques for this group.

One of the least explored resources, but one which clearly exists, is the alumni association as an aid to remaining current in one's field. For example, here is the group which, probably operating on an inter-association basis, could do more to solve the problems of freedom and motivation for the young housewife than any other. Perhaps an inter-association baby-sitting service would be a good beginning. The advantage of organized alumni in terms of publicity, job information, adjustment of job to person and job placement are obvious.

The full development of human resources is recognized as a major necessity today. These are a few suggestions for conservation, together with ideas for increased satisfaction for college women, and increased strength for higher education.

## PRE-LEGAL EDUCATION

### A Statement of Association Policy

**L**AW SCHOOLS are necessarily vitally concerned with the quality of the preparation which students entering upon the study of law bring with them from their undergraduate experiences. For unless that preparation has been of high quality, the law schools can not, in the additional time which they can fairly require of their students, equip them for satisfactory performance within the legal profession and the democratic community.

#### *The Association of American Law Schools and Pre-Legal Education*

The Association of American Law Schools is an organization of schools with the purpose of improving the legal profession through legal education. There is no other comparable organization of schools in the United States. Consequently, the Association has felt that it has an obligation to utilize its unique resources to set forth here, as clearly and briefly as the present state of its continuing study permits, exactly those aspects of pre-legal education it considers most helpful in the study of law and fulfillment of a legal career.

In so doing, the Association has had a number of purposes in mind. For its own use, it has wanted to consolidate its work into a summary statement, both as a prelude to improvements which future efforts will no doubt achieve, and as a point of departure for making the judgments concerning pre-legal education which come its way from time to time, as, for example, in determining requirements and standards relating to pre-legal education for those law schools which wish to become, or to remain, members of the Association. It has seemed, also, that such a summary statement would be useful to colleges and other institutions of learning preparing students for law study as well as to advisers of pre-legal students and pre-legal students themselves.

NOTE: Published at the request of Professor Elbridge D. Phelps, University of Oklahoma, Chairman for this year of Continuing Committee on Pre-Legal Education of the Association of American Law Schools: free quotation is permitted if due credit is given.



*Foreword: Principles and Limitations*

The Association considers certain principles to be controlling. In addition, it is aware of certain limitations in the usefulness of this Statement by others than the Association itself. These principles and limitations are recognized to include the following items. The first two are primarily of interest to educators. The remaining six are of more general interest.

I. Education of students for a full life is far more important than mere education for later professional training and practice. Consequently, there is no attempt here to suggest to the colleges and secondary schools that they sacrifice the former to the latter. At the same time, the Association believes that there is little, if any, conflict between these objectives when a student's goal is the later study of law. All institutions involved are interested in education for citizenship in the world community. The Association feels that the mental accomplishments set forth in the "Recommended Pre-Law Program," which follows, are already in the tradition of liberal education and that, in their devotion to this tradition, experimentation by the undergraduate schools and colleges better to provide this training coincides with Association objectives.

II. In fact, since many of the goals of legal education are also goals of liberal education, the effort of this Statement to segregate aspects of pre-legal education which are relevant to professional legal education results only in emphasizing a part of the opportunities available in most undergraduate institutions—but to no greater degree than would be required by selection for most non-professional purposes. From this overlapping of goals it follows that the Association, while interested primarily in those goals which are pre-professional, must record itself as an ally of efforts to improve secondary and collegiate education on the widest front.

III. The views as to pre-legal education here expressed are preferences useful to pre-professional school students who have decided upon the subsequent study of law. This Statement does not assert that failure to have followed its recommendations will result in disaster in law school. Nor does it purport to foreclose a route to that study which is based on some combination of other professional training, like, engineering, with law. The State-

ment does assert to pre-professional school students that, if their plan is to study law, absent special circumstances, they will do best to heed its recommendations. Students in a position to utilize Association policy in this regard will have considerable liberty to indulge individual tastes without the irritation of curricular straitjackets.

IV. Other things being equal, the pre-law student will be well advised to take advantage of the best undergraduate teaching available in his institution, as he may ascertain that fact with the aid of qualified and informed advisers.

V. In whatever way the student may undertake to accomplish the objectives set forth in the "Recommended Pre-Law Program" below, it is important that he should place himself in a position which will try his capacities to the utmost. The experience of working as hard as he is able will help him to acquire habits of discipline which will stand him in good stead in the law.

VI. Intellectual maturity and devoted allegiance to such homely virtues as honesty and integrity are indispensable aims of pre-legal as well as legal education. These ends should be constant aspirations. However, there is no known way exclusively to allocate their acquisition to any formal or extra-curricular instruction, nor to guarantee them after any particular age has been reached or time spent in school.

VII. In the nature of its position as an association of national scope, the Association can not render this Statement in the degree of particularity which would be possible if it were dealing with a single undergraduate institution as of a given time. It is feasible for it, however, to set forth guides to particularization by those acquainted with the situation prevailing in an undergraduate institution at a certain time. The "Recommended Pre-Law Program," which follows, considered with the rest of this Statement, can furnish such a guide. Advisers are invited to use it, translated into the choices open in their institutions when their advice is to be acted upon. If undergraduate advisers at institutions not a part of a university with a law school desire assistance in any such specification they may consult with the Association of American Law Schools through its Panel of Law School Advisers or its Committee on Pre-Legal Education. Otherwise, they may obtain help from their affiliated law schools. It should also be

pointed out to pre-law students and their advisers that a number of law schools have prepared statements consistent with this one. When prepared, these statements should be consulted with special care by the student preparing for the study of law at the law school issuing the statement. In these respects, the Association recognizes the already great responsibility of pre-legal advisers and faculties of law in matters of pre-legal education.

VIII. The Association's responsibility in matters of pre-legal education can not best be met by prescribing certain courses and extracurricular activities for students planning later to study law. Such an endeavor is foreclosed by the wide range of a lawyer's tasks, and the correspondingly wide range for choice of relevant pre-law preparation. More important, any attempt to prescribe a single course of preparatory work would be invalidated by the fact that the quality of instruction necessarily varies among subject-matter areas and among schools. In one negative respect, however, courses should be mentioned specifically. So-called "law" courses in undergraduate instruction should be avoided. Generally they are not intended as education for lawyers but for other purposes.

#### *Objectives of Pre-Legal Education*

But while it considers the prescription of particular courses unwise, the Association can properly call attention to the quality of undergraduate instruction which it believes fundamental to the later attainment of legal competence. That quality of education is concerned with the development in pre-law students of basic skills and insights. It thus involves education for:

- A. Comprehension and expression in words;
- B. Critical understanding of the human institutions and values with which the law deals; and
- C. Creative power in thinking.

The development of these fundamental capacities is not the monopoly of any one subject-matter area, department or division. Rather, their development is the result of a highly individualized process pursued with high purpose and intensive intellectual effort by persons with at least a reasonable degree of native intelligence. Perhaps the most important variable ingredient of a proper climate for this process is the quality of undergraduate

instruction. Certainly it is not any particular course or combination of courses. Shortly stated, what the law schools seek in their entering students is not accomplishment in mere memorization but accomplishment in understanding, the capacity to think for themselves and the ability to express their thoughts with clarity and force.

#### *Recommended Pre-Law Program*

##### A. EDUCATION FOR COMPREHENSION AND EXPRESSION IN WORDS

The purpose here is to gain both perception and skill in the English language. Language is the lawyer's working tool. He must be able, in the drafting of legal instruments, to convey meaning clearly and effectively. In oral and written advocacy he must be capable of communicating ideas convincingly and concisely. In reception no less than in expression, language is fundamental as the lawyer's medium of communication. For the lawyer must be able to grasp the exact meaning of factual statements and legal instruments, to catch the fine points of legal reasoning and argument and to comprehend the technical materials which constitute the body of the law. To acquire sufficient capacity for communication calls for extensive practice in all phases of the art. Truly, the law-trained man, if he is to perform effectively the tasks expected of him, must be a precisionist in the use of language.

What is needed, therefore, is the skill which can be obtained only through practice in:

1. Expression: adequate vocabulary, familiarity with modern usage, grammatical correctness, organized presentation, conciseness and clarity of statement in writing and speaking.
2. Comprehension: concentration and effective recollection in reading and listening, perception of meaning conveyed by verbal symbols.

Both expression and comprehension also require developed sensitivity to:

3. Fluidity of language: varying meanings of words in different times and contexts, shades of meaning, interpretive problems, hazards in use of ambiguous terms.

4. Deceptiveness of language: emotionally-charged words, catch phrases, hidden meanings of words, empty generalizations.

## B. EDUCATION FOR CRITICAL UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN INSTITUTIONS AND VALUES

The purpose here is to develop insight into, rather than merely information about, the institutions and values with which man is concerned. One pursuing a legal career encounters all sorts of these institutions under circumstances in which his conduct necessarily shapes the conduct of others in their value choices: examples are marriage and the conduct of parties to it; business and the actions of sellers and buyers, stockholders and directors, employers and employees; government and individuals concerned with or subject to taxation, regulation of trade practices and development of atomic energy; private property and its protection and utilization. The lawyer is a force in the operation and shaping of these institutions. It is vital that he perform his work with a consciousness that his conduct counts in the choice of preferable means and ends. This insight comes from intensive study for a substantial period of such of the following areas as he may feasibly undertake, rather than from attempts to skim all the large areas listed. "Study" includes dealing with people in these contexts and reflecting upon the experience thus gained.

Important to the gaining of this insight would be a grasp of:

1. The nature of man and the physical world of which he is a part: stimuli which move him to action, internal and external limitations upon the development of understanding and reason, man's ability to plan conduct and the function of value choices in his planning.
2. The economic systems of societies: theoretical foundations, imperfections in practice, business patterns, the function of governmental processes in economic control.
3. The political organizations of societies: basic theories, modern complexities, the relation of politics to law.
4. The democratic processes in Western societies, especially: responsiveness of governmental policy to popular will, art of compromise, role of education and discussion, functions of majorities and minorities, methods of reconciling com-



peting interests, requirements for participating effectively in world society, degree of efficiency self-government permits, awareness of the moral values inherent in these processes.

5. The social structures of societies: functions of individuals and groups such as the family and churches, implications of the service state, governmental processes in social control, control of the atypical person.
6. The cultural heritages of Western societies, including philosophy and ethics: freedom for the individual; traditions of humility, brotherhood and service; inevitability of change and the art of peaceful, orderly adaptation to change.

### C. EDUCATION FOR CREATIVE POWER IN THINKING

The purpose here is to develop a power to think clearly, carefully and independently. A large part of the work the law-trained man is called upon to do calls for problem-solving and sound judgment. This is true regardless of whether he devotes his life to the practice of law, to governmental administration, or to being a judge, legislator, teacher or scholar, or to some other endeavor. He will be called upon to create or give advice concerning an almost infinite number of relationships. These relationships may range from a comparatively simple contract between a buyer and seller of goods through tailoring a highly complex corporate structure to the needs of a business or non-profit organization. Any task to which he will be called can be done better if he possesses this power of creative thinking. Predicting the outcome of even routine litigation may involve considering whether a hitherto well-settled rule of law which is applicable would, in the light of the particular facts of the case, possibly be modified or reshaped to avoid unfairness and practical inconvenience. Here, the power to think creatively will often merge with critical understanding of human institutions and values, with the latter serving as the necessary threshold to creative power.

Creative power in thinking requires the development of skill in:



1. Research: awareness of sources and types of material, adaptation to particular use, methods of fact presentation.
2. Fact completeness: willingness to recognize all facts, avoidance of preconception and fiction masquerading as fact, disciplined ability to withhold judgment until all facts are "in."
3. Fact differentiation: relevance of facts to particular issues, varying importance of different facts, relative persuasiveness of various facts.
4. Fact marshalling: reduction of masses of fact to manageable proportions, arrangement of facts in logical and convincing order.
5. Deductive reasoning: use of the syllogism, spotting logical fallacies, avoiding conclusions flowing from inaccurate premises.
6. Inductive reasoning: experimental methodology, accuracy of observation, elimination of variables, role of hypotheses, conditions essential to valid generalization such as adequacy of sampling, strict limitation of conclusions by available reliable data.
7. Reasoning by analogy: methods of classification, gradations of relationship, finding resemblances which justify inferences of similarity.
8. Critical analysis: disciplined skepticism in approach, thoroughness of inquiry, keenness of mind in cutting through to essentials.
9. Constructive synthesis: systematic formulation of principles, meaningful organization of ideas, structural relationship of concepts.
10. Power of decision: resolution of discoverable issues in the light of short- and long-term ends found preferable on explicitly identified and justified grounds.

### *Conclusion*

With the foregoing in mind the application of the above objectives and recommended pre-legal program in the light of their controlling principles and limitations can be suggested briefly. A particular undergraduate student's reasoning processes may better be developed at a particular institution,

for example, by work with a specified teacher of biology than with another teacher of logic, his understanding of cultural heritages may be deepened more by some then available courses in literature than by ones open to him in religion, his facility in comprehension and expression in language conceivably strengthened as much or more by work with a history teacher as by some studies in speech or English composition, and his capacity for the handling of facts increased as well by the study of zoology as by the study of sociology, all according to the circumstances obtaining at the particular college and the background of the individual student. In sum, the program of pre-legal education which is here earnestly suggested is to be secured through such courses and other work as the student's vital interests, his counsellor's judgment as to the quality of instruction, and the facilities of the particular undergraduate school or college dictate in each individual case, considering the development of the student as of the time relevant decisions as to his pre-legal program are to be carried out.

## THE CERTIFICATION OF MAN

ABRAM L. SACHAR

PRESIDENT, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

WE have been so deeply concerned about loyalty and subversion and about the grave dangers that threaten us that we have lost sight of the blessings of our heritage and its meaning. We have been so busy protesting what we are *against* that we have paid all too little attention to what we are *for*. Without diminishing vigilance or cutting defense, surely it is useful to re-evaluate the positive credo which gives meaning to American life. We must stop taking for granted the great affirmations which are a solid part of our defense. We must not be abashed by the sophisticates who deride as clichés and as pure “corn” the fundamental sanctions of our American heritage. Maybe if there were more of this kind of “corn” in our teaching, it would be easier to resist the blandishments of alien philosophies which have led astray so many of our young people in their first contact with crisis.

America rests primarily upon four great sanctions:

1. The first is faith in the equality and dignity of man. He is not, as the Communists would have him, a guinea pig in an economic experiment. He is not, as the Fascists insist, a robot in a vast impersonal state machine. He is not, as the Nazis and their contemporary imitators proclaim, a globule in a racial bloodstream. Man is a divinely inspired creature of dignity, with a right to his uniqueness which is not the gift of an economic identification, or a dictator's whim, or an aristocracy's birthright. In Walt Whitman's phrase, which is a superb definition of his place in life, “Every man is as good as every other man—and a damn sight better!”

2. The second sanction in the American heritage is the ideal of equality of opportunity. This is not a guarantee of equality of *condition* which is sheer nonsense and just a mouth-filling phrase for Communist propagandists. It was never intended

NOTE: Excerpts from an address delivered before General Session of 8th Annual National Conference of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, June 27, 1953, Miami Beach, Florida.

that all men remain equal in condition. There are vast differences in talent, in resourcefulness, in ambition, in adventuresomeness, in service. But America promises equality of *opportunity*, the chance to rise, to better one's station, to make talent and skills and resourcefulness count. Mobility in America is not just horizontal, characteristic of our vast restlessness, which moves us from one area to another. Mobility is vertical, too, and it lifts men from obscurity to high estate, from poverty to success. It brings about the great romances which raise a farmer boy from Kansas to the Presidency, a backwoodsman to a Secretary of State, a Negro bondsman to one of the world's great scientists. Vertical mobility is the lure that has brought us our immigration tides, that has peopled our country and has given us the incentives of an economic system which put to shame the doctrinaire philosophies which are long on promise and short on fulfillment.

3. Still another precious part of the American heritage is the assurance that change, economic or social or political, will come through the discipline of the law. There are sharp conflicts and often irreconcilable differences which go to the heart of our lives. We resolve them not because there is a special brilliance in the national character but because, through painful experience, we have developed a system where the law is umpire and we accept its mandate. There is inspiration in a system where an elected President, after a long and hard-fought political campaign, invites his opponent to lunch at the White House. It is good to live in a land where the courts have more than one wall against which, in other lands, dissidents are shot. We have no need for defensiveness in a system where even traitors are given their full day in court. All of this is sometimes less efficient, and it tries the patience of the impetuous, straight-line advocates. But democracy is not an easy form of government; it is government by persuasion, and it operates slowly. But it offers the most enduring protection for freedom of the spirit and the richest fulfillment of man's higher self.

4. Finally, and serving as the cotter pin for all the other elements, is the faith that there is purpose and vitality in the democratic process. In too many countries men have abandoned this faith. There have been so many disappointments and disillusion-

sionments, that cynicism has supplanted faith and opportunism has become a substitute for courage. But freedom cannot be defended by men who prefer the shelter of neutrality, who want nothing so much as to be left alone, who are fearful to own up to convictions, who live and work and have their being in the hidden caves of anonymity.

This then is the American heritage. It is proudly linked to a belief in man and in his God-given dignity. It strives to open out opportunities so that man may release his latent capacities. It has unyielding confidence in the processes of persuasion and education in a system where *lex is rex*. And it is permeated with the faith that there is no iron law in history, no inevitable destiny, no immutable economic cycle which traps man and renders him impotent; rather that man does have the capacity to shape his destiny.

We are spending billions on defense, for guns and ships and planes and atomic weapons. These are desperately needed in a world of constant danger. But *without* confidence in the essential worth-whileness of the sanctions which make up the American heritage, none of these physical assets will prove decisive. *With* this confidence, we have a defense in depth which is our strongest bulwark for the tasks of today and tomorrow.

## THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

GUS TURBEVILLE

PRESIDENT, NORTHLAND COLLEGE

**T**HERE will be a final day of reckoning for all of us. A judgment will be made on college presidents, and when the roll is called for those presidents who lived up to the responsibilities of their positions; for those who always stood steadfastly for academic freedom, for the search for truth, for the right of their faculty and students to examine and discuss objectively controversial issues; for those who never idly made promises, but who, when they did give their words, moved heaven and earth to keep them; for those who frankly admitted their own limitations and who never put personal pettiness above institutional welfare; for those who listened not to vicious gossip of their co-workers, but to merited praise; for those who never chose the easy way out of a difficult situation when they knew that right was on the unpopular side; for those who did not commit sins against their faculty, their students and their consciences in the name of "public relations," but who did practice democracy at all times; for those who were never too busy to be courteous, regardless of who the caller was; for those who looked upon the functions of their office as including leadership in the community, and not following the prejudices of the moment; for those who were sensitive to community needs, but who never bowed to community pressures; for those who worked intelligently and honestly with their boards of trustees; and for those who gave themselves unstintingly and selflessly to the enormous tasks of their office — I hope with all my heart that I can stand up and be counted.

NOTE: Part of Inaugural Address delivered May 16, 1953.



## TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR TEACHERS

W. H. McMASTER

PROFESSOR EMERITUS, UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

I. Have enthusiasm which comes from God inside: *ἐν θεός*, a sense of divine calling.

II. Don't pretend to know more than you do. Admit often: "I don't know." (This is a wholesome agnosticism.)

III. Have high respect for your students as individuals.

IV. Learn from your students. Ask them how to improve your teaching and your courses.

V. Have a sense of humor.

VI. Conduct creative discussions. Inspire questions. Let the student learn to think for himself in an atmosphere of complete freedom.

VII. Love God and your students, making yourself accessible outside the classroom.

VIII. Believe in education, that your students can change and that they can change the world.

IX. Believe in progress, not the escalator kind, but man co-operating with the Divine can make justice and love real in human society.

X. View all things from the standpoint of the Eternal (*sub specie aeternitatis*).

## HIGHER EDUCATION

**A** CONSIDERABLE share of the Corporation's funds is devoted to special research and teaching programs at the graduate level, and these grants often receive the lion's share of publicity because the projects involved deal with new and significant lines of inquiry. The Corporation does not regard these new and specialized programs as "frills" tacked onto the basic task of the colleges and universities. It regards them, rather, as the growing edge, the zone of experimentation, which promises continued vitality in the educational venture.

On the other hand, the Corporation fully recognizes that the heart of the process of higher education lies not in these special projects but in the central task of educating young men and women in the fundamental fields of knowledge. Accordingly, the Corporation has consistently used a substantial part of its income to enable the colleges and universities to perform this task more effectively.

The great tides of change which have swept over the academic world, as over all our world, have moved familiar landmarks, submerged inhabited ground, and thrown up new islands to be explored. New fields of inquiry have emerged, old fields of inquiry face new problems, vast public support is thrown behind certain lines of endeavor and other lines receive diminished attention. It is not surprising that this continuing process of change has produced in us a habitual attitude of re-examination and reappraisal of our goals, our assumptions, our values and the distribution of our efforts. And, since the academic world is nothing if not articulate, this re-examination involves a great clamor of voices. Forward-looking men, who have foreseen the emerging patterns and find significance in them, welcome the changes; but at their side are the faddists and the opportunists and the unstable folk who would welcome and exploit *any* change. Sober and judicious men, who see the losses that come with tumultuous change, regret the breaks in continuity and the washing-out of old landmarks; but at their side are the inert and

NOTE: Reprinted from the Report of the President, Carnegie Corporation, for the year ended September 30, 1952.

the timid and the self-interested who would resist and condemn *any* change.

One of the developments which has produced the most lively debate in educational circles has been the widespread movement to reinvigorate the ideals embodied in the term "liberal education." The goal is rather widely accepted, but there is substantial difference of opinion as to how to achieve it. The general educationists offer a variety of curricular reforms. Advocates of the Great Books press their claims for the wisdom of the past. Humanists decry the shift of interest from certain disciplines to certain other disciplines. Our colleges are literally awash with formulae for salvation: all of which is healthy and part of the process of getting things done in a democratic, heterogeneous and always vigorously assertive society.

Just as someone once remarked that Wagner's music is better than it sounds, so it might be said that all these conflicting recommendations are not as confusing as they seem. There is more than one path to a liberal education.

Man has always sought to understand himself and his society and the world around him, to relate himself to a larger framework of meaning, and to explore problems of values. A liberal education seeks to instill in the student a genuine concern for these fundamental problems. It seeks to expose him to the best that men have thought and written about them. And it seeks to provide him with ways of thinking about them himself. It is a mistake to suppose that there is one favored way to accomplish this.

No one discipline or combination of disciplines provides the unique avenue to the liberation of the mind. The natural scientists—in the first flush of enthusiasm—once thought that they had the golden key to enlightenment, but sensible scientists no longer make this assertion. On the other hand, thoughtful people will find just as ridiculous the currently fashionable characterization of the physical and biological sciences as almost the antithesis of a liberal education—fit only to produce soulless technicians, illiterate in philosophy, innocent of moral values and strangers to the creative life of the mind and spirit. The physical and biological sciences provide as great play for the creative spirit as do the literary fields. There are as many

technicians-without-values in the fine arts as in the sciences. The intellectual climate in which we live has been fashioned in no small part by the physical and biological sciences, and no educated man can ignore their contributions, nor indeed frame a philosophy without them.

In short, the physical and biological scientists can play a significant role in liberal education. That they have not in fact always played such a role is due not to lack of capacity but to lack of vision. There are encouraging signs of an awakening. President Conant and his co-workers at Harvard have provided leadership in this direction with their efforts to develop a new approach to the teaching of science as a general education course. During the current year the Corporation made a grant to Harvard for the continuation of this work.

The social sciences also have a significant role to play. Serious men cannot accept the view of those humanists who rhapsodize over Platonic generalizations about society but resent the efforts of the modern social scientist to test these generalizations. William James said that "the sentimentalist fallacy is to shed tears over abstract justice and generosity, beauty, etc., and never to know these qualities when you meet them in the street, because the circumstances make them vulgar." This is descriptive of the attitude of many scholars who delight in ancient gropings toward an understanding of social behavior but are appalled at modern efforts along this line, chiefly—one suspects—because these efforts involve such vulgar equipment as card-sorting machines. But, like the physical scientist (and, for that matter, the philosopher), the social scientist is also capable of ignoring the basic problems of liberal education and following only the single track of his specialized studies.

Representative of current efforts on the part of social scientists to re-examine their role in liberal education is the work of a group of faculty members at Washington University, who are attempting to develop a new introductory course in the social sciences, with the assistance of a grant from the Corporation.

The role of the humanities in liberal education needs no defending. These disciplines have been traditionally at the heart of the liberal arts curriculum, and their significance is undiminished today. Developments such as the new American Studies

program at Barnard College and the courses in Asiatic Civilization at Columbia University would be impossible without vigorous participation, indeed vigorous leadership, on the part of the humanistic fields. But there is nothing in the humanistic fields which offers a guaranty of salvation. They too have turned out narrow technicians when they might have been turning out educated men. They too have often ignored the central concerns of liberal education.

The truth is that we cannot look to any particular field or set of fields for salvation. There are many and varied ways to a liberal education—many starting points and many routes. And there are many kinds of men who, each in his way, may be called liberally educated. Liberal education results not from any specific subject matter but from a way of teaching and an attitude toward learning.

The teacher, it should go without saying, is the central ingredient in any kind of education, and above all in liberal education. The world of higher education has sometimes forgotten that it is subject to the same absurdly simple but inflexible rule which governs all pedagogy; good teaching requires good teachers. A conviction that the teacher is a more important factor in education than the curriculum is reflected in a series of grants made by the Corporation during the past year. An appropriation of \$50,000 enabled Princeton University to continue the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship program which is designed to attract able college graduates into academic life through the award of first-year graduate fellowships. This program has proved so successful in recruiting into the teaching profession young men and women of vigor and ability that it has now been taken over by the Association of American Universities and will henceforth be operated on a nationwide basis.

## PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION\* (Book Review)

HUNTER B. BLAKELY

SECRETARY, DIVISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE  
U. S.

TO APPRECIATE this book one needs to know the author, who is today one of the more interesting persons in American education. He is a devout Roman Catholic but numbers his friends far and wide among those of other faiths. He has that generous spirit of magnanimity, that give-and-take attitude, which enables him to see the viewpoints of others and cooperate wholeheartedly in common enterprises. His whole life has been spent in education with most diversified experiences. Beginning as a teacher in the public schools of New York City, he has taught in high schools, colleges and universities; served on numerous boards and educational committees; worked on governmental commissions; written numerous books and articles on the subject; and has for 25 years served as President of Mount Mary College for women in Milwaukee.

Out of this experience he now presents the book, "Philosophy of Education." In a way the volume may be described as a compendium of this educator's life-time thinking, reading, experience and meditation on education. As those who know him would expect, it is characterized by the author's common sense, humor, generosity, penetrating insights into the actual problems of education and his ability to write with clarity.

The structural arrangement of the book is different. It is divided into eight sections, (1) What is Education? (2) What is Man? (3) Heredity, Environment and the Individual, (4) Psychology of Education, (5) Pedagogy of Education, (6) The Sociology of Education, (7) The Administration of Education, (8) Moral and Religious Education. Each chapter is arranged with a series of *Exploratory Questions*; followed by the author's statement of his case; then there comes a section *Main Proposi-*

\* *Philosophy of Education* by Edward A. Fitzpatrick. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 1953. 475 pp. \$4.00.



tions in which the author restates the main propositions summarily and succinctly; *Questions and Problems*, in which the real issues are raised; followed by *Some Additional Thoughts*, usually in the form of quotations; and then a bibliography for the chapter. At the end of the book there is a valuable glossary of educational expressions and terms.

This unusual format is due to the author's hope that the book may find various uses—textbook, source book on education, group discussion book, handbook for educators and also a book which may be read by educators for a thought-provoking experience on their problems, successes and failures in education.

Some insights of the author are stimulating. Over and over again he insists that education must be measured by what it does for the individual, the making of good men and good citizens. He emphatically rejects any materialistic concept of man and rightly urges that only as man is educated as a citizen for two worlds, for life now and life hereafter, will the individual be able to orient wisely his living on this earth. Without the vision of eternity, earthly existence is impoverished, often into futility. He believes that a trouble with too much of our modern education, which forgets Western man's religious heritage, is that it is concerned with the fruits, ignoring the roots from which it has grown. It is encouraging to find a book based firmly on the central convictions of Christian faith, and stating this emphatically. The good life, according to this author, in which the individual has dignity, in which society has moral values, in which history has purpose, is life under God—directed at great aims, as Fitzpatrick puts it from his Roman Catholic catechism: "to know, to love, and to serve God in this world, and to be happy with Him forever in the next"; or as this Presbyterian reviewer would quote from his catechism: "Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him forever."

As our author states "education in a confused world" needs a complete rethinking. Here is a helpful book for any wishing to enter upon this adventure of thought.

## THE MANAGEMENT OF UNIVERSITIES\*

### (Book Review)

EDWARD A. FITZPATRICK

PRESIDENT, MOUNT MARY COLLEGE

**T**HE views of so distinguished a university president (chancellor) make a significant addition to educational literature. The discussion is broader than the title of the book.\* It discusses management, but it includes the great educational policies which must guide enlightened management.

I was glad to find included in the book what was regarded at the time as the revolutionary statement critical of the accrediting process as conducted, made in 1931 before the North Central Association. This is followed up by the 1939 statement which said: "After this preliminary and more or less courteous maneuvering, I shall now hoist the black flag. I have made it my mission in life to prey on you and all your kind. I am against standardizing, any standardizing whatever, and against all accrediting. I am persuaded that it would be better for the future of higher education, if you were all to disappear as of tomorrow, and if your places were left permanently vacant." (p. 262.) The recent activities of the National Commission on Accrediting are directly related to these speeches.

The attitude toward labor unions of teachers is stated with Dr. Capen's usual directness: "Teachers as teachers should not join labor unions. Bodies of teachers should not become locals of the AF of L or the CIO." (p. 56.) Such associations in Dr. Capen's opinion is unfortunate, has damaged the teaching profession and cancelled the gains of teachers as a profession.

Within the space limitations it is not possible to discuss all the topics, but a specially significant part of the book is the emergent discussion of the university as such—a discussion much needed in American higher education. There is still the remains of the present hybrid institution. The university problems as such are included in the first (Who Should Manage Universities

\* *The Management of Universities* by Samuel P. Capen, formerly Chancellor, University of Buffalo. Foster & Stewart Publishing Corporation, Buffalo, New York. 1953. 287 pp. \$4.75.

and How) and the final paper (The Idea of a University). A theme that runs through the book—academic freedom—is here summarized:

The university is and must be an institution without intellectual boundaries. It is and must be wholly free to prosecute the search for truth. Any aspect of nature, any work of man, any accepted idea, any respectable prejudice, any institution of society must be open to its inspection, must be subject to evaluation by it, must be for it a fair field for new discovery. There must be no restraints upon the publication of its findings and interpretations, whether they happen to be popular or unpopular. Those who pursue the truth under the sponsorship of the university cannot walk in jeopardy of their careers, should they chance to offend a board or a board member, or an administrative official or even an important segment of the general public. If such a condition is imposed on them, the institution responsible is not yet or is no longer a university. (p. 10 and a similar statement on pp. 281-282.)

A blunt discussion of the incompetent who get into a university occasionally would have helped. The attitude toward Communism is clearly indicated in the baccalaureate address (1948) on "False Labels and Code Words in the Cold War." We should not be "complacent about the machinations" of Communists and their deluded, but often innocent "fellow travelers," but should keep a "hawk-like watch on them," "expose their plots" and hold them "accountable as individuals for any illegal activity." "And by our votes as citizens and as members of organizations we should keep them out of positions of leadership in either public or private affairs." (p. 208.)

The discussion of the university is historical and practical rather than philosophical. The attitude is the one which Dr. Capen thinks is important in college presidents—horse sense.

There is a prophetic sentence in Newman's classical discussion of the university about the advancement of knowledge. The universities were concerned with the preservation and transmission of knowledge, and professional training. Authorities were expounded, the university was insulated from contemporary life. The emergence of the American university about sixty years ago had its revolutionary impulse in Germany with the scientific movement. The size and complexity of the American university

gives rise to many problems; the rise, too, of the problems of the management of American universities and the parts to be played by trustees, president and faculty. A significant part of the discussion is the part played by the American Association of University Professors. The attitude toward the presidency is critical and the book contains in this connection a striking statement of the Jehovah complex. Who should manage the universities is given largely in the terms of the report of the standing committee of AAUP in the "Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration." (p. 15.)

## AMONG THE COLLEGES

**A**MERICAN UNIVERSITY held a most successful fete attended by more than 2,000 people, for the benefit of the Art Department, and cleared more than \$6,000.

**A**SSUMPTION COLLEGE received from the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation a gift of \$150,000 for restoration of the buildings wrecked by the tornado of June 9. This foundation was established by the family of Lieutenant Joseph P. Kennedy, U.S.N.R., killed in World War II, son of former Ambassador to Britain Joseph P. Kennedy and brother of Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts.

**A**UGUSTANA COLLEGE (Illinois) has received \$240,000 for its library in a College Library Achievement Fund Campaign run by the Board of Christian Education of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. This was an over-subscription of about \$40,000.

**C**ORNELL UNIVERSITY will establish a new electrical engineering center with a gift of \$1,200,000 from the Phillips Foundation of New York which was created by Ellis L. Phillips of Plandome, Long Island, a Cornell engineering alumnus of the class of 1895 and a former president and chairman of the Long Island Lighting Company. The School of Electrical Engineering is the oldest of its kind in American colleges and universities.

**G**ETTYSBURG COLLEGE has recently been bequeathed the following: \$5,000 for endowed scholarships from the estate of J. Elsie Miller of Philadelphia; \$10,000 from the estate of Jesse E. Benner, Lancaster, Pennsylvania; \$1,175 to be added to a previous gift by Charles B. McCollough of Detroit, Michigan and \$21,600 in the will of Julie W. Turn, Tunkhannock, Pennsylvania.

**H**URON COLLEGE has received \$35,000 from the will of Glen T. Waibel, wealthy Huron business man.

**ILLINOIS COLLEGE** has been given one half of the estate of Mrs. Florence E. Burrus, approximately \$15,000, to be known as the Burrus Fund in memory of her husband; a \$5,000 bequest by Isaac Tomlin and \$1,000 from Mrs. Berthe Schroeder to establish a Louis H. Schroeder Scholarship Fund in memory of her husband, '98.

**LAMBUTH COLLEGE** has raised \$1,320,617 in a Development Fund Campaign Drive, a large proportion of which was subscribed by ministers and laymen throughout the Conference.

**OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE** received for 1952-53, gifts which totaled \$516,000, bringing the two-year total, 1951-53, to \$2,145,335. Included is an anonymous gift of a principal sum of \$875,000 subject to a life income.

**RADCLIFFE COLLEGE** is building a research library to collect material on three centuries of the social and historical contributions of American women. It will include histories of the women's colleges, records of the Associate Collegiate Alumnae, the American Association of University Women and the Woman's Educational Association of Boston. The library is available to any qualified adult, although it is particularly for the faculty and students of Harvard University and Radcliffe College. Contributions of documents on American women and also funds would be appreciated. Write to Mrs. Richard Borden, Director, Radcliffe Women's Archives, 10 Garden Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

**TUFTS COLLEGE**, in the last annual report of President Leonard Carmichael who recently retired after 14 years as President to become Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, gives these interesting financial statistics: In 1937 endowment was \$7,600,000 and today it is over \$11,000,000; value of the college plant has risen from \$3,600,000 at that time to \$6,600,000; the operating budget today is \$5,750,000 compared to \$1,300,000 then.

**UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT** has been bequeathed \$30,000 by Mrs. Andrew M. Cooper, a charter member of the



Board of Trustees. She also left the college the Cooper residence to be used as a home for the president, "or for any other purposes as the school may see fit." A total of \$242,270 has been contributed by 117 local firms and industries to the University's 25th anniversary building fund drive.

Gifts from industries to institutions such as the University of Bridgeport are actually investments. Investments in the future of young men and women, in industry itself, and in the American way of life. The local manufacturers deserve the highest compliment for making such an investment at this time.

(Reprinted from an editorial in *The Bridgeport Post*, Thursday, June 18, 1953.)

**WHITWORTH COLLEGE** has been presented \$50,000 by Mr. and Mrs. Walter A. White of Spokane, Washington to be used for scholarship help to deserving young people at the college, and to be known as the Ethel Fairchild White Scholarship Fund in honor of Mrs. White.

**WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE** has completed a fund of \$130,000 for the purchase of laboratory and scientific equipment: \$65,000 was contributed by the Kresge Foundation if the college raised the additional amount; Mrs. E. S. Pillsbury of St. Louis gave \$20,000 and \$20,000 was received from the Missouri Baptist General Association, and the college added \$25,000.

## NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

- Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, North Carolina. Travis A. White, Minister, First Christian Church, Lubbock, Texas.
- Berry College, Mount Berry, Georgia. Robert S. Lambert, Rector, Calvary Episcopal Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. Bishop Bryan J. McEntegart, Ogdensburg, New York.
- Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa. Sister Mary Aloysius.
- Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville. Henry King Stanford.
- Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas. Evan A. Reiff, President, Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Nathan Marsh Pusey, President, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin.
- Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois. William K. Selden, Director of Admissions, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
- Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana. Raleigh W. Holmstedt, Assistant Dean.
- Iona College, New Rochelle, New York. William H. Barnes, Trustee and Chairman of the Departments of Language and Literature.
- Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. Lowell J. Reed, formerly Vice President.
- Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas. John E. King, Jr., Academic Dean, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Limestone College, Gaffney, South Carolina. Andrew J. Eastwood, Acting President.
- Manhattan College, New York, New York. Brother Augustine Philip, Executive Vice President.
- Marymount College, Salina, Kansas. Mother Mary Helena.
- Mercer University, Macon, Georgia. George B. Connell, Vice President.
- Miner Teachers College, Washington, D. C. Matthew J. Whitehead, Professor of Education.
- Mount St. Agnes College, Baltimore, Maryland. Sister Mary Cleophas Costello.

- Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York. Francis H. Horn, Executive Secretary, Association for Higher Education, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
- Regis College, Denver, Colorado. Richard F. Ryan, Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Rosary Hill College, Buffalo, New York. Sister M. Angela Canavan.
- St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas. Walter J. Buehler.
- Shorter College, Rome, Georgia. George A. Christenberry, Dean, Men's College, Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina.
- Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama. Luther H. Foster, Jr., Business Manager.
- University of Alabama, University, Alabama. Oliver C. Carmichael, President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York.
- University of Denver, Denver, Colorado. Chester M. Alter, Dean, Graduate School, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.
- University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri. Earl J. McGrath, former U. S. Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C.
- University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Gaylord P. Harnwell, Professor of Physics and Atomic Physicist.
- University of Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania. John J. Long, Assistant to the Provincial of the Maryland Province, Society of Jesus, Baltimore, Maryland.
- Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan. Clarence B. Hilberry, Acting President.
- West Virginia State College, Institute, West Virginia. William J. L. Wallace.

# COLLEGE AND CHURCH

---

VOLUME XVIII

FALL, 1953

NUMBER 3

---

A Philosophy of Christian Higher Education, <i>William F. Quillian, Jr.</i> .....	481
Religious Emphasis Weeks:	
The Beginning of a Symposium, <i>William G. Ryan</i> .....	494
Pro and Con, <i>Donald M. Cleary</i> .....	496
The Program of Religious Emphasis Week, <i>Robert E. L. Bearden</i> .....	498
Planning Brings Results, <i>Phillips P. Moulton</i> .....	501
Editorial Items .....	505

COLLEGE AND CHURCH is the educational news bulletin of the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges. The opinions expressed in the various articles are those of the respective authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Commission. They are presented in conformity with the policy of this publication which provides for freedom of discussion concerning problems of Christian higher education.

## A PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

WILLIAM F. QUILLIAN, JR.

PRESIDENT, RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE

SOMEONE has said that there are only two ways by which one can get along in this somewhat confused world and still retain his sanity; one is to stop thinking and the other is to stop and think. I imagine there are times in the experiences of most educators when they must confess that for the most part they have followed the former alternative. Not that they have deliberately decided to take a moratorium on thinking; it is simply that they have been so caught up and carried along, willy-nilly, by the highly pressurized stream of things to do, that there has been no time for thinking in any real sense of the word.

This occasion, however, is one set up with the deliberate intent of giving us an opportunity and a modicum of stimulation to follow the latter alternative, that is, to stop and think about the central task in which we are engaged—Christian higher education.

There are compelling reasons for our trying to work out a sound philosophy of education. These reasons have to do, first of all, with ourselves as educators. We need the perspective which can be supplied only by the discovery of some unifying principle which enables us to see the relatedness and significance of all that we are doing. Without such a perspective, we lose a sense of direction. The daily life becomes little more than mere routine, or, as the late William Temple put it, life becomes just "one damn thing after another." I make bold to inject this mildly profane statement because it comes from the pen of so eminent a divine. I might add that in subsequent usage Archbishop Temple substituted for the quoted expression the initial letters, *odtaa* out of regard for the sensitivities of his readers. Because we lose a sense of direction for our efforts, we easily be-

NOTE: Address given at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools and Colleges of the Methodist Church, Statler Hotel, Los Angeles, California, January 6, 1953.

come involved in contradictions. These contradictions may appear in a single course or department between, for example, the verbal instruction in democracy and the denial of it in the conduct of one's teaching. Contradictions may appear in the relative attention given to the academic, the social and the other extra-curricular programs of an institution. They sometimes are seen in the kind of considerations which enter into the selection and the retention of faculty members. It is particularly easy for contradictions to arise when an institution is hard pressed financially—and which one of us here is not familiar with this situation? An adequate philosophy of education is no panacea, but without it and the resulting sense of direction which comes to an institution or to an officer of an institution, there can be no health.

Furthermore, we need the motivation which comes from an adequate philosophy. You will recall Feuerbach's saying, "Mann ist was er isst." ("Man is what he eats.") Similar in form but widely different in intent is the Biblical saying, "As a man thinketh, so is he." When this latter statement is understood, not in a narrowly intellectual sense, but in a more deeply functional and existential sense, we find it strongly supported in human experience. What we truly believe to the extent of committing ourselves to it does make a difference in our lives. I am not overlooking the important place which non-rational influences have in motivating human behavior; these are powerful, and their influence is the greater in those persons where the rational influences are not prominent. But man's humanity consists partly, we believe, in the fact that he is capable of formulating philosophies which in part determine his actions. The way in which I understand man, the way in which I understand myself and my place in the whole scheme of things, will make a difference in the way in which I live up to the principles which I profess.

A clearly formulated and reasonable philosophy of education is important, not only because of what it can do for ourselves as educators but also and perhaps more importantly because of what it can mean for our students. I am not in the least pessimistic about students and young people in general, and yet one cannot escape the prevalence of varying degrees of fatalism



among them. They are caught on the familiar treadmill of unrelated and often meaningless activity which seems to be leading nowhere in particular. As long as there persists any manifestation of a resulting fatalism, we have failed in our educational task. The remedy for such failure is only in an adequate philosophy of education shared alike by administrator, teacher and student.

In undertaking to discuss "A Philosophy of Christian Higher Education," I am aware of at least two problems. One is the widespread suspicion, if not the fully confirmed opinion, that philosophy is, as the schoolboy defined it, "the putting of ordinary things in vague and abstract language so that nobody can understand it." This conception of philosophy is not unknown among professional philosophers themselves; indeed the presidential address delivered before the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association a few years ago bore the title "The Cult of Unintelligibility," it being a gentle chiding of the members of this association for the prevalence of this condition among themselves.

The second problem, and one more germane to the subject of this paper, arises from the fact that the topic assigned has to do with *Christian* higher education, the assumption apparently being that there will be some difference between what might be said on this topic and what might be said about simply—a philosophy of higher education. Let me make it clear that I am not objecting to the topic; indeed, I consider it a most pertinent and relevant one. There is, however, the possibility that to some persons it might seem that we are beginning with certain unexamined assumptions, namely, the tenets of the Christian faith, and that our philosophy of education will necessarily be framed so as to include these and their implications. As a philosopher, I find a more congenial and a more defensible approach to questions to be that of beginning with a minimum of assumptions. Among those assumptions which seem to me inescapable is that of the capacity of man's mind to reach some understanding, however partial it may be, of the whole range of reality which comes within his own experience, both inner and outer. If, starting from this assumption, our inquiry should lead to an affirmation of the central beliefs of the Christian faith, such an affirmation

will then be on an altogether different foundation than if it were the starting point of our discussion. Moreover, such an affirmation is one which any reasonable person might find himself compelled to endorse by the logic of the argument. A discussion which does not initially assume an outcome in terms of Christian beliefs will probably gain a wider hearing than one which does contrariwise. My evangelical heritage causes me to favor this approach which seems to hold greater promise of making converts. One might protest against the implication that there might be any non-Christians needing conversion in such a group as this. In reply it sufficeth to say that I find no limiting clause having reference to presidents, deans or other officers of Methodist-related colleges in the Master's admonition to "preach the Gospel to every creature."

In this paper we shall deal with three aspects of a personal philosophy, these being our understanding of man, of the universe and of Jesus Christ. Then we shall suggest certain implications for our educational task which follow from the acceptance of the positions reached on the above problems.

### Man

The starting point for a philosophy of education should be man. He is the center of attention and indeed the *raison d'être* of the whole business of education. An understanding of his nature should be the first consideration in the formation of a curriculum and in the development of methods of instruction.

Whatever one's ultimate view of man is, all will agree that man is a creature of nature. There are those who insist that the only meaningful statements which can be made about man are those which we find in the descriptions of him proffered by the various natural sciences. This is the position defended by the positivists. But to many such a view seems inadequate. It fails to do justice to those qualities of persons which cause us to honor and respect and love them. I may have the most complete account of the chemical composition of an individual's body, of the biological processes of his body, of the principles of physics which find expression in the functioning of his body. But when I have gone as far as I can with the natural sciences, I discover other data about man which have not been explained, and, what

is more, I realize that these other data are those which make man the unique creature he is. These data relate to the fact that, as Robert Calhoun has so well phrased it, man is "a servant of superior values and powers." With this view of man, we see him not only in terms of what he is but in terms of what he can become and what he aspires to. In this understanding of the possibilities of man for goodness, for truth and for beauty we find the real nature of man and his true glory. It is this insight which the writer of Genesis was seeking to express when he spoke of man as made in the image of God. These possibilities of man are similarly the basis for the many ways in which the Hebrew prophets and Jesus called attention to the supreme worth of persons.

Some thinkers, while rejecting the reductionism of the positivist, prefer to include all these qualities of man within the range of the natural, insisting that nature manifests itself in different levels including these higher valuational experiences of man—his aspirations and his possibilities for goodness, beauty and truth. Others believe that a supernatural interpretation alone can adequately account for the uniqueness of man. If the former group interpret nature so broadly that it includes what has often been regarded as supernatural, then there is little basis for serious differences between these two ways of looking at man. More important than the differences is the significant area of agreement on the worth, the value, the importance of man and on his possibilities.

#### *The Nature of the Universe*

But man is only a part of the whole of reality, therefore our search for a philosophy must move on to the question of the nature of the universe. Philosophers find here many important and difficult problems which command their attention, problems of the one and the many, of mechanism and teleology and the like. But these problems ultimately resolve themselves into the fundamental question of the existence of God. This question is really that of whether or not there is any meaning and purpose in the universe as a whole. What can be said on this?

All about us we see nature in its multitudinous forms—as earth and minerals, as plants, as animals, as man with all his marvelous capacities, as the seas and the mountains, as the sun,

the moon, the stars and the planets. Only a limited amount of reflection upon the amazing combination of variety and order within nature brings one smack up against the questions of *How?* and *Why?* As one's scientific understanding extends his knowledge of his world, these questions become even more insistent.

There are two kinds of answers possible. One is to say that there is no explanation, that things simply exist as the result of blind forces operating without any meaning or direction. The main difficulty with this answer is that it is no answer at all. It is rather a refusal to seek for an adequate explanation of data which are ever-present in man's experience. The other kind of answer is that given by those who, recognizing the difficulty of the problem, still are not content to give up the quest for understanding. These are impressed by the very existence of the universe, by its continuous production and sustenance of life, particularly its bringing forth ever new qualities in the appearance successively of living organisms and then of man with his capacity for rational behavior and with his moral and aesthetic and religious experiences. To such persons the interpretation of these data which seems most reasonable—indeed which seems demanded by the facts—is that this whole universe is characterized by a process which is creative, which judges and which is also redemptive.

This latter interpretation of the universe seems to us validated by a critical examination of the whole range of our experience. It sees man as the creature of an on-going, creative, purposive process and thus both a partial revealer of and also a participant in the ultimate purpose and meaning of the universe. It sees all existence as ultimately dependent upon God—as creator, judge and redeemer. The redemptive or healing process of the universe is not always recognized for what it is, and yet it is at work all about us and within us. In a simple way we see it whenever we suffer a bodily injury. For example, if I cut my hand, the healing powers of nature (or of God, if you will) immediately go to work. I cannot heal the injury, but I can cooperate with this healing process of the universe. Less evident to the eye of man, but nonetheless real, is the operation of the redemptive process of the universe in the lives of individuals and of society. I cannot bring health to a sick society,

but I can seek to discover and eliminate some of the conditions which stifle the expression of the creative, redemptive process in individuals and in groups. In affirming the presence of purpose and of meaning in the whole of reality, this view makes an important contribution toward removing the sense of frustration and fatalism which often cuts the nerve of human endeavor. But more about these implications later.

### *Jesus*

Having considered the nature of man and of the universe, we turn next to the final one of the three salient features in our Philosophy of Christian Higher Education. This is the place of Jesus Christ in our thinking and in our living. The inclusion of a consideration of Jesus is important, not just because we have a prior interest in and commitment to *Christian* higher education, but because we are seeking that philosophy which will undergird and guide any educator in performing his tasks most effectively. I prefer to believe that my view of Jesus is not solely a product of my having been born into a Christian environment, but that it is at least in part a product of my own mature understanding and judgment.

As with all great religions, Christianity is concerned with salvation. If the world needs anything desperately, it needs salvation. If we ourselves and our students need anything desperately, it is salvation. When I speak of salvation, however, I am not thinking of being saved from some fiery furnace after we die, though what I refer to is not unrelated to man's final destiny. Rather, I am thinking of man's need to be saved from his frustrations and confusions, from the sense of inadequacy which haunts his efforts, from the feelings of regret which result from failure to live up to the best within him. These are manifestations of or products of man's failure to harmonize his own life with the creative, purposive life of the universe. In more theological terminology, these are manifestations of or products of man's alienation from God, or of man's sinfulness.

As we have already suggested, there are healing, redemptive processes at work in the universe. God is not indifferent to man's plight. He is continuously seeking to save man, but His efforts are continually thwarted by the refusal of man to discover or to follow the direction of God's purposes. In Jesus we



find man's best hope for salvation. There are two ways in which we may understand the redeeming work of Jesus. First, in His life we find the fullest revelation of the nature of God and of the will of God as it finds expression in the creative, purposive process of the universe. Thus we find some insight into the kind of ends and goals which must be sought if we are to avoid the frustrations and confusions which result from going our own way in ignorance of, or in willful opposition to, the purposes of God. And, secondly, Jesus makes possible our salvation by making available the necessary motivation to do the will of God. This motivation results from the compelling attraction of His perfect goodness. All of us know the power of a noble person to bring out the best in us. It is this same power raised to the nth degree which one finds when he comes into a close and meaningful fellowship with Jesus. I do not believe that the saving work of Jesus is something mysterious and near-magical, as it is often interpreted. When so interpreted, it becomes meaningless and unavailable to many people, including many professing Christians. The interpretation here suggested should have an appeal to the understanding of all, which will make the saving power of Jesus more widely available. To summarize, salvation becomes possible when one harmonizes his life with the on-going direction of the universe (or with God's purposes). This direction (or these purposes) has been demonstrated for us in Jesus' life and teaching, and in the uplifting attraction of fellowship with Him we find the motive power to live in harmony with God.

#### *Implications for Education*

Thus far we have dealt mainly with three central elements of a personal philosophy, these being the nature of man, the nature of the universe and the unique place of Jesus in history and in human experience. What, now, are the implications for our educational task of the conclusions reached on these questions?

The most obvious and yet an often ignored fact is that education is concerned ultimately, not with textbooks or audio-visual aids nor with dates and theories and formulae, but rather with persons. Because persons are capable of personal response, the educational process must provide ample opportunity for such response. The effective teacher is the one who leads his students to see that learning is a matter of discovery. No one can give



another person an education, for the educated person is characterized by something which has happened within him. As Alfred North Whitehead suggests in "The Aims of Education," a student is not like a jigsaw puzzle whose pieces simply need to be put into place by some outside force in order for wholeness to be achieved. A student, rather, is a living organism and as such grows by his or her own creative impulse towards self-development and towards wholeness.

If this self-discovery and self-development are to be genuine, the student must be allowed to participate in decisions which affect him in both academic and non-academic matters. Only thus can a person's capacity for responsible self-direction and social participation be developed. Irresponsible behavior on the part of students can often be traced to a feeling that they have not been given any real responsibility.

Furthermore, if there is to be any genuine self-development, if man's capacity for creative imagination is to flourish, there will be maintained an atmosphere in which free inquiry is permitted and encouraged. A study of history shows us that the greatest contributors to the eventual establishment of true understanding have not been those who have sought to stifle new ideas but those who suffered persecution and sometimes martyrdom because of their pioneering insights. The names of Socrates, of Jesus, of Galileo come to mind in this connection. As Judge Learned Hand said in his *Saturday Review* article of November 22, 1952, entitled "The Future of Wisdom in America,"

The mutual confidence on which all else depends can be maintained only by an open mind and a brave reliance upon free discussion. I do not say that these will suffice; who knows but we may be on a slope which leads down to aboriginal savagery. But of this I am sure: if we are to escape, we must not yield a foot upon demanding a fair field, and an honest race, to all ideas.

Our understanding of man has yet another important implication for Christian higher education. Because man is a creature with many capacities and possibilities, there is laid upon an educational institution and its entire staff a heavy responsibility, namely, to inspire their students to the highest fulfillment of their potentialities. I am thinking here of potentialities for intellectual development, for aesthetic appreciation, for artistic

creativity, for noble living and unselfish service to one's fellows. I use the word "inspire" advisedly because this aim can be achieved in no other way than through the example of persons who are themselves so vital that others cannot long associate with them and continue in well-worn ruts. This is what Alfred North Whitehead has in mind when he says that "moral education is impossible apart from the habitual vision of greatness." ("The Aims of Education," Mentor edition, p. 77). Such inspiration will be found in literature, painting, music, ideas and historical personalities when these are introduced to the student with genuine understanding and appreciation. In an essay which appeared in the autumn 1947 issue of *The American Scholar* entitled "The Prerequisite of Christian Education," Gordon K. Chalmers penetratingly outlines the irreplaceable contribution which the study of literature makes to an understanding of Christianity. The contribution of which he writes is not in any direct teaching about Christianity but in the understanding of man at his worst and, most important, of man at his best which is found in great literature. As President Chalmers explains:

Literature is concerned with all the comparisons of man, downward and upward. But without an extensive knowledge of literature, one may freely make only the former. In literary study alone lies the knowledge and the peculiar ability which permits one to assemble sense, reason, intuition, imagination, nuance, metaphor and overtone in order to apprehend the whole event of men's inner lives which gives them dignity, frees them to be humorous, and provides three-quarters, at least, of those intimations of powers beyond apprehension which lead us to suspect or to believe that we do not live out our lives unattended by divinity, nor wholly in this mortal body.

Also, students should see in at least some of their instructors the vision of greatness which inspires them to more complete fulfillment of their latent possibilities and to nobler living. The greatness of an educational institution might most accurately be measured by the number of students who leave its halls feeling with respect to someone there, "That's the kind of person I should like to be."

But now let us turn to our conception of the universe as creative, purposive and redemptive and ask what are the implications

of this view for our educational task. The first is the most important and the most needed of all. It is that such a view gives assurance that there is some ultimate meaning and purpose to existence. We may see that meaning and purpose only "as through a glass darkly," but the confidence in its reality provides the motivation needed for worth-while endeavor. Such an assurance opposes the dangerous sort of moral relativism which is all too prevalent. Also such an assurance provides an organizing reference which can bring some degree of unity to human knowledge.

But there is also a very special continuing task laid at the doorstep of educational institutions by the acceptance of a purposive view of reality. This task is that of discovering the nature of these ultimate and eternal purposes and then of working out those programs and those institutions which will best promote them. Certainly the task of education is to help persons to make intelligent choices and decisions; if this task is to be accomplished, those persons must be brought to relate their choices to the eternal purposes of the universe (or to the will of God). To the fulfillment of this task all the various disciplines in a college or university curriculum can make a contribution.

This is hardly the place, and certainly there is not the time for any complete discussion of just what these eternal purposes might be. Furthermore, I am not sure that I nor any other mortal can say anything very conclusively and exhaustively on this subject. Still, rather than leave this part of our discussion with too much vagueness, I shall venture to suggest three goals which might, with considerable confidence, be pointed to as being in harmony with the eternal purposes of the universe. One is the development of persons of integrity. By integrity is meant honesty not only in dealing with other persons, but also about one's own scale of values. The person of integrity will not attempt to fool himself or others into thinking that the lower is better than the higher. A second apparent purpose of the universe is the development of persons characterized by a keen sense of social responsibility. The more inclusive one's social sympathies are, the nobler the person. Persons with narrow social sympathies, whether it be a Hitler or Mussolini or their counterpart in American life, are "little" people. The little people and

what they stand for are doomed to destruction, whereas the noble persons and what they stand for will ultimately prevail. Why? Because these latter, I believe, have discovered something of the eternal purpose of the universe and they have allied themselves with it. A third eternal purpose which I believe we see revealed in the course of human history is the achievement of greater social justice and with it the achievement of peace. I would not be so naive as to suggest that the attainment of these goals is imminent or even that they will ever be achieved. Man's power to thwart their achievement is fearful and wonderful to behold. And yet it is quite evident that there are human values represented in these ends which persistently press themselves in upon us and thus give evidence of their being related to the whole creative process of reality. The emancipation of women and the freeing of slaves are illustrations of such moves toward greater social justice. The almost complete acceptance in this country of the necessity of equality of opportunity for all persons is another. The arguments, for example, recently heard by the Supreme Court in favor of segregation were not over the *principle* of equal opportunity, but rather were over what constitutes equal treatment. The idea of a world-wide cooperative effort for justice and peace embodied in the League of Nations was destined to have the rebirth which it received in the United Nations, and if this latest embodiment of this goal should be destroyed by its critics, both here and in other nations, this idea will emerge again. And so it is also with other efforts and institutions which are devoted to the achievement of justice and peace.

The task of our colleges and universities, then, is first to lead our students and faculties to formulate our ultimate goals by seeking to discover the eternal purposes of the whole cosmic process and then to mobilize our best intelligence and efforts toward working out the best ways of realizing them.

And now, finally, what does our understanding of the unique nature and mission of Jesus imply for our educational task? This can be put very briefly and simply. It is to see that all our students are confronted with Jesus so that the kind of salvation which we have described might be accomplished in their lives. Though I have used some rather traditional terminology in stating this task, I would hasten to add that many of the traditional

approaches to this task will fail miserably with students. Again, there is not the time for discussing how this is to be done even if I felt that I knew the best methods. But until an institution has discovered a way or ways of effectively confronting its students with Jesus Christ, it has shortchanged them.

Three final observations and I shall be through.

1. An institution committed to the sort of philosophy which we have outlined and to the implications suggested will be an exciting, vital place. Such an institution will not be dealing mainly with the superficial paraphernalia of life but it will involve its students and faculty in meaningful participation in the most important task for mankind—the search for life's meaning and goal and for ways of implementing the achievement of these.

2. An institution so committed will step on a few toes. Some persons whose limited ends and goals are thwarted or by-passed by an institution which sees its job clearly and pursues it steadfastly may react violently, in some cases even to the point of withholding financial support. An institution committed to Christian principles, however, will be guided by one concern alone: What is the will of God and what is in harmony with the fullest possible achievement of His goals?

3. Such an institution will achieve eternity, not of bricks and mortar and not of organizational structure, but of accomplishment—accomplishment of the ends for which it strives and to which it is dedicated.

## RELIGIOUS EMPHASIS WEEKS: THE BEGINNING OF A SYMPOSIUM

WILLIAM G. RYAN

CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS, COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN  
HIGHER EDUCATION

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The Commission on Christian Higher Education has noted the spread of interest in Religious Emphasis Weeks on our college and university campuses. The members of the Commission feel that the time has come for a cooperative exploration of this development. What can we learn from the experience of those who have organized and led Religious Emphasis Weeks? How is a significant program arrived at? How should the preparations be organized and carried out? How should the religious leaders be selected? How can they be found? What are the results desired? Are they achieved? How do we know?

The papers which follow have been written by three experienced organizers and leaders. The papers do not exhaust the subject, nor are they meant to. Their purpose is to stimulate further contributions and to promote a fruitful discussion of the matter through the Commission on Christian Higher Education and through these pages. It is worth noting and emphasizing one thought that runs through these three papers, and that is that Religious Emphasis Week, whatever it be called, must be genuinely religious. If it is devoted to learned expositions of history or philosophy or aesthetics or any other secondary aspect, it will not perform its function. Religious Emphasis Week must offer to every participant, including the leaders and organizers, a real experience of the truth, the stimulation and the consolation which God offers us in Jesus Christ Our Lord. On this, I think, we will find general agreement. The Commission would sincerely welcome the views and reactions of other persons interested in this feature of Christian campus life.



## RELIGIOUS EMPHASIS WEEKS—PRO AND CON

DONALD M. CLEARY

CATHOLIC CHAPLAIN, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

During the past few years there has appeared on the campuses of our colleges and universities a phenomenon called by various titles, such as "Religion in Life Week," "Campus Conference on Religion," "Religious Emphasis Week," etc.

I have called it a phenomenon because it is just that. Timidly and with apologetic air, these "weeks" were started and I am sure the instigators of the affairs held their breath awaiting the outcome. They expected apathy, ridicule and opposition. Much to their surprise (in most cases) the expected apathy turned out to be enthusiasm; the expected ridicule became praise and the expected opposition developed into cooperation.

Naturally this did not happen in all places all at once, but the fact does remain that now on practically every campus in the United States and especially the State and secular or non-denominational campuses, a "Religious Emphasis Week" is a regular part of the college and university program, and what is more significant, more colleges are adopting the idea each year; and at those institutions where it has become a regular annual event, the program is being expanded and greater depth being given to the subject matter and its application to daily campus life.

I have seen the development of a "Religious Emphasis Week" at Cornell University from its very beginning to the present (we called it a CAMPUS CONFERENCE ON RELIGION) and I have participated in several such weeks at other institutions. As a result of this experience I have several definite conclusions on the subject. The *good* results achieved so outweigh any contrary results that in my opinion the latter need not be considered. The *good* results are as follows:

(a) The institution sponsoring or cooperating in such a "Religious Emphasis Week" is in effect saying to the campus and

NOTE: Very Reverend Monsignor Donald M. Cleary has been Catholic Chaplain at Cornell University since 1936 with the exception of four years as chaplain in the U. S. Army Air Corps. For three years he was national chaplain of the Newman Club Federation.

to the public: "Religion is Important." "Religion is a Science." "Religion has Academic Stature." "Religion should be intelligently discussed and studied." Such a stand on the part of the college authorities puts the subject of religion and religious inquiry on the level where it rightfully belongs, and is a complete about face from the attitude taken by some of those same schools not so many years ago.

(b) The planners of the Religious Emphasis Week—staff, faculty and students—all working together over a period of several months, achieve much religious growth themselves. It is impossible to work with such a group without having the rough edges of one's own intolerances and misunderstandings smoothed off to get to know other viewpoints and to appreciate even more deeply one's own religion.

(c) The general student-body is bound to feel the impact of a well-planned Religious Week and this impact is productive of much good. To my mind the one great tangible benefit, among many smaller benefits, is that religion is held up to the student as something very important and therefore worthy of his consideration. The smaller benefits, such as the organization of religious "bull sessions," the increased reading of religious literature, the examination of one's own religious status, are all important, but to eradicate once and for all from the mind of a student the conviction that religion is unimportant, a matter for sissies and old people, is an effect beyond evaluation.

On the negative side, there are the criticisms one hears. "What can you do in a week?" "The student participates to some extent, then dismisses the whole thing until the next similar event rolls around."

The answer lies in the fact that (a) you do not try to do everything in a week—there is planning and follow-up; (b) the active participation of a given student in a few events is far better than no participation at all.

Other people, I am sure, in other articles will cover the important topics of planning, themes, techniques and personnel, as they apply to the Religious Emphasis Week. My purpose has been simply to discuss the philosophy of the Religious Emphasis Week. I feel that such a week is fast becoming an integral part of the American educational scene and also that as a phenomenon at

first because of its unique character, it is now assuming a real stature and a definite place in the American educational scene. Perhaps I could best sum it up this way: A Cornell alumnus of the class of 1902 would be quite amazed if he were to visit his Alma Mater in the fall of 1953 and find thousands of young students pausing in the midst of a busy routine to ponder and discuss, listen and draw conclusions about religion as it affects them now and after college.

I hope the 1902 alumnus would also be quietly pleased in the knowledge that today's students haven't completely lost sight of their religious heritage, nor has his Alma Mater been derelict in presenting the subject of religion to the student in a manner consistent both with the school objectives and religious importance.

## THE PROGRAM OF RELIGIOUS EMPHASIS WEEK

ROBERT E. L. BEARDEN

METHODIST DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT, CONWAY, ARKANSAS

Religious Emphasis Week on a college campus is a most significant part of the program for the year. The observance means that the college is not content merely to acquaint students with the role of religion in our culture, it is eager to provide also programs of inspiration and worship for the enlightenment and spiritual benefit of the college community. Here, however, as in so many other situations, maximum effects can be realized only through well-laid plans carefully executed.

Much depends on preparation and cultivation; faculty members and students should be made aware that Religious Emphasis Week is on the calendar and organized plans should be made early for its observance. Follow-up activities are also important, for the full meaning and influence of the Week's activities will not be confined to the short period. But most important of all is the Week itself. What are the best features of a well-planned program? Every one who has helped with these affairs doubtless is ready to express opinions on this question. Suggestions stated here have been derived from experiences on many campuses. No one Week has been found using all of them.

The first essential is a unified theme for the Emphasis in which every part of the program fits. This does not mean, of course, that informal discussion groups may not deviate from this theme, for the genius of college "bull sessions" is complete freedom. Even here, however, the central topic may serve to hold the group together with a common interest.

NOTE: The Reverend Robert E. L. Bearden (A.B. Henderson State Teachers College; B.D. Duke) is a member of the North Arkansas Conference of the Methodist Church. At present he is district superintendent at Conway, Arkansas. He has participated in Religious Emphasis Week programs at Hendrix College, Arkansas State College, Arkansas Polytechnic College, University of Arkansas, Centenary College of Louisiana and Southwestern Louisiana Institute.

The subject should be chosen by the students. The planning group may question the student body informally in order to find a subject that interests the greatest number of young people, or a mimeographed questionnaire, suggesting various topics, may be distributed among the campus community.

It is important to allow sufficient time for these preparations. A hastily chosen theme may cause embarrassment or meet with indifferent response. It must be something that is of vital interest to the students. Many persons called upon to help with these programs have been surprised to find that Religious Emphasis Weeks dealing with matters of basic belief and the search for some convictions that give meaning to life are far more popular than superficial themes.

Each campus will have a character peculiar to itself which will require a distinct subject. I once spoke as the Protestant minister on a campus whose student body was largely Catholic. Since the two faiths shared the week the subject was aptly chosen, simply "God is Love." We discovered that in this theme there was mutual interest without danger of controversy.

It seems to me that there are seven types of meetings which are most effective during a Religious Emphasis Week. Each one can be used in a carefully planned program:

1. Chapel Services. The entire student body should be reached if possible. There should be three such services, probably Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Fewer times than this do not get the speakers before the students enough for them to become acquainted.
2. Morning Watch. A very brief worship before breakfast conducted by the students. The resource people should attend but should not take an active part.
3. Seminars. The best time seems to be in the late afternoon, perhaps just before dinner. Several seminars may be conducted in order that no one of these sessions will be too large. Resource persons other than the speaker may lead them. Subjects should be chosen that fit the main theme.
4. Private Conferences. Each speaker and resource person in the group should be assigned a room and remain there every day for a period of about two hours. The best time seems to be from two to four each afternoon. I have had the experience of waiting without a single student coming to the

conference room for the first day or two and then on the last day they have come in great numbers. At one school I got away just fifteen minutes before train time on the last day. This is because the young people are "sizing up" the speaker and they will not seek a conference with him until they feel able to place confidence in him.

5. **Classroom Assignments.** Some time during the Religious Emphasis Week the classes may be offered an opportunity to have one of the speakers for one class session. It may be that on some campuses only classes in the humanities will be interested. The visitor will speak briefly and lead discussions on a Christian view of the subject with which that particular class is concerned.
6. **Late Evening Dormitory Discussion Groups.** Speakers should be assigned to dormitories where students will gather in informal groups in the parlor for a few minutes of questions and discussion, ending with a hymn and prayer and "good nights." I would like to add here that it seems best for the speakers to live in dormitories. It will not be as quiet or as comfortable, but it is far better than staying in a distant hotel and commuting for meetings.
7. **Sessions with the Faculty.** The faculty should have an opportunity to know the visiting speakers. A luncheon is sometimes arranged or a brief meeting at an hour when it is convenient. It should, of course, be by voluntary attendance and a discussion of student problems is preferable to a formal worship service.

Finally, let it be said that the visitor will do his best work not in formal groups, but in the rapport he establishes with the students. He should linger over the soft drink bar at the Union, stroll on the campus and chat with young people in a relaxed and congenial attitude.

All this will create a full week for any visiting speaker. No Religious Emphasis Week is an easy matter. I have shared in weeks in which each day began with the 6:30 a.m. watch and ended after the 10:30 p.m. dormitory discussions. It is, however, one of the most rewarding bits of work any minister can do. The opportunities for genuine witness for Christ present a challenge hardly equalled in any other area of Christian effort.



## PLANNING BRINGS RESULTS

PHILLIPS P. MOULTON

LECTURER IN RELIGION AND HIGHER EDUCATION, UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

"The Week was successful in arousing a much greater consciousness of religion. The campus now realizes that religious values have dignity, power and definite application in life situations." . . . "The campus was awakened to the intellectual acceptability of the Christian faith."

These quotations of the Campus Committee chairmen from two different types of schools are typical of many statements contained in detailed evaluations of Religious Emphasis Weeks. Yet on many campuses such weeks are ineffective. What makes the difference?

Experience in directing some forty University Christian Missions<sup>1</sup> has taught me the significance of *thorough preparation*. Here are some of the hints we pass on to planning committees on both large and small campuses:

*Choose the date carefully and keep the calendar clear.* Avoid "mid-terms," home-coming, elections and other distracting events. If unavoidable conflicts arise, try to utilize them for the advancement of the program.

*Make your plans far in advance.* Secure copies of the University Mission Workbook, with its wealth of suggestions.<sup>2</sup> Invite your leaders early; they are often "dated up" months or years in advance. Choose your committees early. Select a theme, discover student interests, have a planning retreat—several months before the speakers arrive.

*Include the whole campus in your plans.* Appoint a representative committee of about 100 students, faculty members, religious workers and administrative officials. Make sure it in-

<sup>1</sup> Large-scale Religious Emphasis Weeks, sponsored by the National Council of Churches and the United Student Christian Council.

<sup>2</sup> Obtainable for 75¢ from: University Christian Mission, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York.

NOTE: Doctor Moulton has served previously as Director of Chapel House at the University of Chicago and as Director of the University Christian Mission.

cludes campus leaders who can "open the doors" for the program. Such departments as drama, public speaking, music, art and journalism should be well represented. You will want an executive secretary in charge of the planning who has administrative ability, time and adequate office facilities.

Combine the best publicity methods used on the campus to convey the idea that you are not just planning a double dose of preaching. Stress the rough-and-tumble skeptics' hours and bull sessions. Ask fraternities, co-ops and dorm groups to vote on the seminar topics. Of course, all the religious organizations will want to pull together, but you must go beyond them to reach the whole campus. If enough people and groups are involved in preparation, you won't need to worry about attendance.

*Create a fellowship of prayer.* Open and close your committee meetings with worship, and sponsor vesper services on the Mission theme during the months of preparation. Only when consecrated individuals and groups pray that God's will may be done through your program will it have the power to change lives.

*Prepare your leaders.* Try to secure a balanced team of able leaders—not necessarily "big names." The chief requisite is ability to answer student questions in small discussion groups. Send your leaders information about the school—catalogues, school papers, publicity material, religious programs, denominational percentages, statements about student interests and anything that will help them picture your campus.

Send their tentative assignments at least a month in advance, revising them as the date approaches. On the day before the Mission begins hold a retreat, at which visiting leaders and the local committee may plan and worship together for several hours. Follow this with daily meetings of the same group to keep checking results and modifying team strategy.

*Don't put all your eggs into one basket.* Vary your approach. Hit the university from all angles. Then you can have a successful week even if some particular sort of meeting is not very effective. If we had depended on convocations at the University of Illinois or personal conferences at Pennsylvania State Teachers College, these Missions might have failed, for those particular events were not very successful. Yet the Missions were effective, for we did not depend on any one approach. We had mass meet-

ings, dormitory bull sessions, classroom discussions, daily seminars, faculty meetings, personal conferences, departmental convocations and many other events.

Classroom appearances and informal discussions in living units are usually rated most effective by campus evaluation committees. Use the leaders in whatever ways are most strategic on your campus.

*Follow up the Mission.* Before the Religious Emphasis Week begins, you will want to appoint a Follow-up Committee to plan how its values may be preserved. During the week, officers and advisors of student religious organizations can discuss with visiting leaders how best to take advantage of the interests and enthusiasms aroused by the Mission. Christian commitment should be stressed at the final meetings, but it should be commitment to specific tasks.

A "continuation meeting" on the last day affords leaders an opportunity to point out local needs and methods of meeting them. This might be followed by similar conferences on the part of each student religious organization and by a retreat at which all who helped plan the program might draw up specific recommendations. Then from time to time you will want to check to make sure the recommendations are being followed, in order that lasting results may be attained.

These results of carefully planned programs have been noted on many campuses:

1. Interest in Christianity was aroused in students who had previously seemed indifferent. The cumulative effect of religious discussions all over the campus is expressed in these words from a campus of 5000: "The Mission touched intimately a larger number of students than had ever been reached before. We are still talking about it."

2. Misconceptions regarding religion were replaced by understanding. Crude and distorted stereotypes of the church can be dispelled by the right approach. As a "bull session" on one campus, finally broke up at 2:00 A.M., a student exclaimed, "This type of religion I can really get hold of!"

3. Christian students were often led to a more complete dedication of life. Some decided to enter church vocations; others

saw a new relevance of the Gospel to the occupations for which they were preparing.

4. Faculty members were stimulated to consider religion more seriously. The faculty sessions caused many professors to reflect more carefully upon the effects of their teaching on the religious life of the student. Some who had previously dismissed religion lightly came to realize the need for reckoning with it more adequately.

5. Campus religious work has been strengthened. By revealing local needs and opportunities a Religious Emphasis Week often incites student Christian groups to evaluate their activities and develop new types of program. Moreover, a basis is frequently laid for closer interdenominational or interfaith cooperation.

The inspirational effect is revealed in these words of a campus Y. M. C. A. secretary: "The whole week gave me a new impetus in my work and a new purpose to serve these students who are hungry for guidance."

## EDITORIAL ITEMS

**RELIGION AS SALVATION, What Christianity Is—Its Nature, Scope, and Dynamic Force** by Harris Franklin Rall, professor emeritus of theology, Garret Biblical Institute, is a clear and persuasive statement of the Christian doctrine of religion as salvation—of man's desperate need for salvation, and how he can attain it. Dr. Rall surveys the entire field of Christian theology, dividing it into three logical and well organized parts. Teachers, students, theologians and ministers will find that this work brings into focus the essentials of contemporary theology. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York and Nashville, 1953.

**THE CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO CULTURE**—the schism between faith and our secular culture—its cause, effect and remedy by Emile Cailliet, author, scholar, anthropologist and theologian, conclusively shows that religion is not a passing phenomenon in mankind's growth and development, but a primary and original shaper of human culture. Basing his viewpoint on what he sees as the true nature of God and reality, he outlines the Christian approach to culture and demonstrates how he can restore the creative orientation of our common life and lead to the "peace of a great dawn." Throughout this penetrating discussion, the author, Stuart Professor of Christian Philosophy at Princeton Theological Seminary, points out how erroneous concepts of Christianity have worked against its proper relationship with culture. Carefully and thoroughly he traces the origin and result of historical and contemporary views which seek to ground culture in a non-religious aspect of life and points out that cultures have always sickened and died when they lost their relationship with reality. With a profound conviction of urgency, this work shows what man has lost and suffered because of Christianity's isolation from culture. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York and Nashville, 1953.

**THESE THINGS REMAIN** by Carlyle Marney, pastor of First Baptist Church, Austin, Texas, contains ten messages that give a graphic picture of the age we live in—the evils in the society

as a whole and the futility of a man's life when he leaves God out. Distinctive in form and dynamic in content—this is preaching with a sensitive awareness of the thoughts, emotions and needs of people in all stations of life—soldiers, legislators, students and businessmen. This is forceful writing that communicates the conviction that Jesus Christ is the real answer to frustrated, aimless, hungry lives. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York and Nashville, 1953.

LUTHER H. EVANS, recently elected Director General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, began his acceptance speech by asking leave to utter a short prayer:

Mr. Acting Director General, and members of the Secretariat, President and Delegates, the representatives of sovereign nations, believers in different Gods, adherents of many religions or philosophies of life, I wish to utter a short prayer to my own God: 'Almighty God, make my heart and spirit humble in the face of the mighty tasks which have been placed on my shoulders. Make me realize always that the power man exercises springs, not from himself, but from approval of his fellow men. O, God, make me realize that the work of UNESCO is the work of many men who believe in many different Gods or systems of belief; make me tolerant of all men, and make me respect their right to follow the light shed on their respective prayers by their respective creeds or beliefs. Make me forever observant of the truths which wise and great men have made plain in many ages, that almost without exception the great religions and philosophies of life have much in common, and would, if practiced well, lead men forward toward peace and understanding. O God, cleanse my heart of selfishness, pettiness, enmity, revenge, anger and unjustified mistrust, and give me strength, wisdom, and goodness in greater measure than before in order that I may help my fellow men reach Thy goal of peace. Amen.'





## THEY SAID . . . "IT COULDN'T BE DONE!"

When we were asked by the Three Conferences of the Louisville Area of the Methodist Church to conduct campaigns to raise \$2,500,000 for four colleges, there were those who said, "It can't be done!"

At the conclusion of the third campaign, all within one year's time under our direction, the goal was over-subscribed for a total of \$2,568,493!

Once again, our 45 years of successful fund-raising experience . . . our proven techniques and skilled direction have helped to bring reality to a great Higher Christian Education program.

If you are faced with a College fund-raising problem, we will be happy to consult with you without cost or obligation.

*Write for College Folders*

**WARD, WELLS, DRESHMAN  
& REINHARDT**

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York 20, N. Y.

*Charter member of The American Association of  
Fund-Raising Counsel.*

## MARTS & LUNDY, INCORPORATED

521 Fifth Avenue  
New York 17, N. Y.

•  
Public relations and  
fund-raising counselors

•  
For colleges and other philanthropic  
institutions.

Charter Member of The American Association  
of Fund-Raising Counsel

### "WHICH OF THESE BALFOUR SERVICES FITS YOUR NEEDS"

#### INSIGNIA REQUIREMENTS

College rings—Badges—Keys  
Fraternity Insignia—Service  
Awards

#### AWARDS FOR ACHIEVE- MENT

Medals—Cups—Trophies—  
Plaques—Scholarship awards to  
stimulate effort.

#### SYMBOLS OF OFFICE— Custom

made to order in 10K gold, set  
with diamonds and precious  
jewels, the College President's  
Jewel of Office is a beautiful  
symbol of the jeweler's craft and  
is worn at official functions.

#### PAPER PRODUCTS (Engraved)

Distinctive engraved stationery—  
Invitations  
Christmas Cards  
Dance Programs  
College Diplomas  
Announcements  
Banquet menus and Place Cards  
Membership certificates and Cards

#### SCROLLS AND CITATIONS

To honor service and achievement.  
Hand engrossed and illuminated  
in color.

*"Write us regarding your requirements"*

Official jeweler to Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Tau Beta Pi  
and other leading honorary and social  
fraternities and sororities

L. G.

**BALFOUR**

COMPANY

Main Factories

Attleboro, Massachusetts

## **ANNOUNCING**

### **The Conflict in Education**

**By ROBERT M. HUTCHINS, Former Chancellor,  
University of Chicago**

With his characteristic vigor and critical forthrightness, the most controversial critic of American education here brilliantly challenges the prevailing philosophy and practice of higher education and presents an eloquent statement of his own position. **\$2.00**

### **The Changing Humanities**

**AN APPRAISAL OF OLD VALUES AND NEW USES**

**By DAVID H. STEVENS, Former Director for the  
Humanities, The Rockefeller Foundation**

A life-long scholar in the humanities brilliantly demonstrates their indispensable value within the college curriculum for conserving the liberal tradition, and offers a helpful statement of the possibilities of a proper balance of studies among the several humanities. **\$4.00**

### **Philanthropy's Role in Civilization**

**ITS CONTRIBUTION TO HUMAN FREEDOM**

**By ARNAUD C. MARTS, President,  
Marts & Lundy, Inc.**

An eloquent plea for the continuance of private philanthropy, this is a methods book for all concerned with fund-raising for institutions. "A needed and useful guide to our understanding of voluntary philanthropy as an important element in the American way of life."—From the Foreword by DR. KARL T. COMPTON. **\$3.00**

*At your bookstore or from*

**49 E. 33rd St.**

**HARPER & BROTHERS**

**New York 16, N. Y.**

## **ASK US about fund - raising**

Our long experience and special skills in Institutional Financing have introduced us to many schools and colleges. We shall be glad to tell you how we have been serving these other institutions . . . and how we can now serve yours.

*No cost is incurred in our  
initial study of your data.*

## **PIERCE, HEDRICK & SHERWOOD**

Incorporated

**30 Rockefeller Plaza      New York 20, N. Y.**

## **THE TUITION PLAN**

The Tuition Plan was founded in 1938 to provide a method by which approved schools and colleges can make monthly payments available to all their students and still receive their fees in full before the beginning of each term.

The Tuition Plan increases enrollments and materially reduces operating costs.

Full information will be sent to schools and colleges promptly upon request.

## **THE TUITION PLAN, INC.**

**347 Fifth Avenue  
New York 16.**

## **TIAA**

established by Carnegie organizations in 1918 to serve the *life insurance* and *annuity* needs of the educational world.

## **CREF**

established by TIAA in 1952 to permit a portion of annuity premiums to be invested in common stocks.

By the end of CREF's first twelve months of operation, more than 60% of the 616 educational institutions with TIAA plans had made CREF available to their staff members. Now 12,000 educators are contributing a portion of their annuity premiums toward unit-annuities, based on common stocks, as a complement to their TIAA fixed dollar annuities. Each succeeding month increases the number of participants.

Inquiries are welcome. For full information just mail a card with your name, address, institution, and the word "details" to TIAA-CREF.

**TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION  
COLLEGE RETIREMENT EQUITIES FUND**

**522 Fifth Avenue**

**New York 36**

**American Committee for  
Emigre Scholars, Writers and Artists, Inc.**  
62 West 45 Street, New York 36, N. Y.

Placement service for universities, colleges, junior colleges,  
and research projects.

Highly qualified teachers and research workers on all academic levels available from countries around the world. Many have additional American training and experience. Their fields cover all branches of the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, the fine arts and music.

Service for translation, editing and preparation of manuscripts in 68 languages and in all fields of research.

Dr. Nelson P. Mead  
Chairman

Alphonse B. Miller  
American Friends Service Committee

Dr. Else Staudinger  
Executive Director

**TAMBLYN AND BROWN, INC.**

— Established 1920 —

•  
Thirty-three years of public relations and  
fund-raising counsel to America's most  
distinguished universities, colleges  
and private schools  
•

6 East 45th Street  
New York 17, New York

Branch Offices—Boston, Mass.; Cleveland,  
Ohio; Washington, D. C.

*(Charter Member American Association of  
Fund Raising Counsel)*



## **THE GOSPEL AND THE GOSPELS . . . . .**

**JULIAN PRICE LOVE.** In this fresh and distinctive approach to the study of the gospel of Christ, a widely recognized New Testament scholar shows how the four Gospels have one essential message—Christ's "good news" of redemption. With clear insight and felicity of expression, Dr. Love interprets the results of the best New Testament scholarship—offering every reader a bridge between superficial knowledge of the Gospels and an enlightened understanding of them.

**\$2.75**

## **MANDATE TO HUMANITY . . . . .**

**EDWIN McNEILL POTEAT.** In this scholarly study the Ten Commandments speak with compelling urgency to Western man—to men caught between the pressure of materialism within and communism without. Dr. Poteat explores the historical background of the Commandments, their meaning for the Israelites, and their essential truths by which they have defied the erosion of time and the often hostile environment of social change. With penetrating insight and pointed examples he makes clear their meaning for our own day and culture.

**\$3.75**

## **THE BIBLE AND YOU . . . . .**

**EDWARD P. BLAIR.** Here is a reliable, up-to-date guide to the wonderful adventure of reading and *understanding* the Bible. These stimulating chapters offer you the opportunity of finding out for yourself what the Scriptures really mean as "a library of redemptive books." They will lead you to a keener interest in the Bible, deeper understanding of it, and a sharpened awareness of its meaning for your own life.

**\$2.00**

## **THE KINGDOM OF GOD . . . . .**

**The New Abingdon-Cokesbury \$7,500 Award Winner**

**JOHN BRIGHT.** To almost everyone, "the Kingdom of God" is a familiar and much-used phrase. Here Dr. Bright explores its biblical meaning—its history, usage and various interpretations—and finds that the Kingdom concept embraces the total message of the Scriptures. Against this background he relates the message of the Kingdom of God to the contemporary world and church. Here is vivid awareness of the unifying theme of the Bible—its redemptive summons to every individual and its challenge to the living church. PUBLISHED OCT. 5.

**\$3.75**

## **PSYCHOLOGY OF PASTORAL CARE . . . . .**

**PAUL E. JOHNSON.** A comprehensive and definitive survey of pastoral psychology as applied to the entire range of the minister's work—counseling, preaching, administration, etc. Theoretically sound and concretely practical, it will serve as an effective introduction to the whole field of psychology as applied to the pastor's task—showing how to use pastoral psychology to achieve an effective, well-rounded ministry. PUBLISHED OCT. 5.

**\$4.75**

## **THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY . . . . .**

**Edited by J. RICHARD SPANN.** Fifteen writers, each one an authority in his field, seek to formulate from the teachings of Jesus a philosophy by which the church may deal with the problems in our present social world order. An honest and constructive search for truth in many critical areas—and a forthright presentation of the responsibility of the church in social improvement. PUBLISHED OCT. 5.

**\$2.75**

at your bookstore

Abingdon-Cokesbury Press

*Announcing August publication of*

**NEW HOPE FOR THE RETARDED**  
Enriching the Lives of Exceptional Children

Morris P. Pollock and Miriam Pollock

c. 224 pp., illus., \$4.50

"It is written in terms that are easily understandable to the layman and it should be a great help to the many people who have to deal with this sad situation in their families," Eleanor Roosevelt. "It should be of great help to all of us who work with such children and who need to plan a total program for the child," Irving Kaufman, M.D., Judge Baker Guidance Center.

*Just Published*

**HANDBOOK OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS**

34th ed., 1152 pp., red silk cloth, \$8.00

The most complete and detailed study of private education yet to appear, describing some thousands of schools, this volume supersedes all previous editions.

**GUIDE TO SUMMER CAMPS**

8th ed., 112 pp., cloth, \$2.20; paper, \$1.10

Lists and describes 500 private camps. Enrolment, tuition, features, summer and winter addresses of directors, date of establishment, etc., are given.

**PORTER SARGENT**

11 Beacon St.

Boston 8, Mass.

*The JOURNAL of*  
**HIGHER EDUCATION**



symbolizing the ascent of learning, stands for the steady climb of excellence of the JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION. All teachers and instructors in colleges and universities should be regular readers of the JOURNAL.

"I have been a subscriber to the JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION since the beginning and I am amazed at the continuous high quality which you have been able to maintain through the years," is the testimony of a nationally known educator.

**Subscription \$5 a year**

**OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

**COLUMBUS, OHIO**

# Drinking in College

by Robert Straus  
and Selden D. Bacon

This is the long-awaited report from the Yale Center for Alcohol Studies. A book for parents, educators, students, religious leaders, doctors and all who provide guidance for the young.

For years people have generalized about student drinking. This Kinsey-type report gives the facts for the first time. It will tell you—

- 1 *Whether your son or daughter will learn bad drinking habits at college*
- 2 *When, what, why and with whom they drink*
- 3 *The influence of parents, income, religion and ethnic background*
- 4 *The false issues raised by the wets and dries*
- 5 *The influence of drinking upon sex mores.*

It is based on a survey of 17,000 men and women students in 27 representative American colleges.

*At your bookseller—\$4.00*

**Yale University Press**  
New Haven 7, Connecticut

## The BULLETIN

American Association  
of  
University Professors

AN EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL by teachers and investigators, presenting articles and reports of concern to all who are interested in or are a part of our institutions of higher learning. Current subjects: higher education and national security; educational programs and policies; faculty-administration relations; freedom of inquiry and expression; economic status of the profession; tenure; the evaluation of faculty services; professional ethics.

Published quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December).

Circulation 42,000

*Subscription \$3.00 a year*

**American Association of University Professors**

1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.

Washington 6, D. C.

**Drinking**  
**in**  
**College**

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent of drinking in college and to identify the factors which influence drinking behavior. The study was conducted in a large, coeducational college in the Northeast. The sample consisted of 1,000 students, selected at random from the college's directory. The data were collected by means of a self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire asked students to report on their drinking habits, including the frequency and quantity of drinking, and on various factors which might influence their drinking behavior, such as social pressure, peer influence, and personal characteristics. The results of the study indicate that a significant portion of the college population drinks alcohol, and that drinking behavior is influenced by a variety of factors. The study has important implications for college health and safety programs.

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent of drinking in college and to identify the factors which influence drinking behavior. The study was conducted in a large, coeducational college in the Northeast. The sample consisted of 1,000 students, selected at random from the college's directory. The data were collected by means of a self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire asked students to report on their drinking habits, including the frequency and quantity of drinking, and on various factors which might influence their drinking behavior, such as social pressure, peer influence, and personal characteristics. The results of the study indicate that a significant portion of the college population drinks alcohol, and that drinking behavior is influenced by a variety of factors. The study has important implications for college health and safety programs.

**Drinking**  
**in**  
**College**

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent of drinking in college and to identify the factors which influence drinking behavior. The study was conducted in a large, coeducational college in the Northeast. The sample consisted of 1,000 students, selected at random from the college's directory. The data were collected by means of a self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire asked students to report on their drinking habits, including the frequency and quantity of drinking, and on various factors which might influence their drinking behavior, such as social pressure, peer influence, and personal characteristics. The results of the study indicate that a significant portion of the college population drinks alcohol, and that drinking behavior is influenced by a variety of factors. The study has important implications for college health and safety programs.



# HOW ARE YOU FIXED FINANCIALLY?

The next few years will determine the future course of American colleges and universities.

Now is the time to examine your fund-raising and Development Program plans for the next five to ten years.

You can learn of new methods and concepts, which are proving effective in obtaining adequate support, by inviting us to confer with you without cost or obligation.

## AMERICAN CITY BUREAU

*40th Anniversary Year*  
1913 - 1953

221 NORTH LA SALLE STREET  
CHICAGO 1, ILLINOIS

470 Fourth Avenue  
New York 16, N. Y.

FUND-RAISING

PUBLIC RELATIONS

*(Charter Member American Association of  
Fund-Raising Councils)*